This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3433 07029839 7

ZPH
Union

THE UNION REVIEW.

THE

UNION REVIEW.

A Magazine

OF

CATHOLIC LITERATURE AND ART.

VOLUME THE SIXTH.

(VOLUME THE THIRD OF A NEW SERIES.)

JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1868.

LONDON:
J. T. HAYES, LYALL PLACE, EATON SQUARE;
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & CO.
NEW YORK:—POTT & AMERY.
MDCCCLXVIII.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
122110
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
R 1899 L

LONDON:
SWIFT AND CO., REGENT PRESS, 55, KING STREET,
REGENT STREET, W.

CONTENTS OF VOL. VI.

LEADING ARTICLES.

	Page
Blessed Virgin Mary, The ..	193
Cardinal Ximenes (Pts. I. and II.)	24, 113
Cardinal Mezzofanti	304
Cardinal Howard	222
Cardinal York	398
Church Music	10
Conception of the Blessed Virgin	513
Corporate Re-union from an Orthodox Point of View ..	321
Decay of Evangelicalism	429
Double Procession, Mr. de Lisle on the	539
Dr. Newman and the English Orders	481
English Ignorance of Worship ..	1
Essays on Re-union	63
Hepworth Dixon's "New America"	414
Lambeth Conference, The ..	141
New America	289
Orthodox Doctrine of the Departed, The	41
Parochial Clergy in the Middle Ages, State of . ..	528
Present Crisis, The	254
Rationale of the Services of the Holy Eastern Church	239, 385
Recitation of the Divine Office, The	97
Recent Essays on the Church ..	330
Recent Sermons	443
Re-union with Protestant Dissenters	210
Sanctuaries of Anglican Churches, The	343
Signs and Wonders of the Latter Days	159
S. John Damascene	141

FRAGMENTA VARIA.

	Page
Condemnation of Honorius ..	82
Œcumenical Council, The ..	457
Encyclical Letter of the Bishops	79
Letter to the Eastern Prelates from the Archbp. of Canterbury ..	81
Letter to the Sec. A. P. U. C. ..	83
Letter Apostolic from the Pope to the Oriental Bishops ..	561
Letter of the Pope to non-Catholics	562
MacColl's Exposure of the Anglo-Continental Society	454
Russian Synod and the British Bishops, The	355

CORRESPONDENCE.

Church in Spain, The	273
Conversion of the Jews, The ..	278
Dr. Newman on Anglican Orders	549
"Kiss of Peace, The"	275
Orthodox Doctrine of the Departed, The	176

ORIGINAL POETRY.

Angelus, The	179
Angels' Greeting	281
De Profundis Exclamantes ..	567
Latin Version of Mr. Lyte's Hymn	280
Modern Pilgrimage, A	463
Offering, The	86
Our Lady of the Snows	85
Pilgrims, The	358
Shelley	180
The Holy Eucharist	566

LITERARY NOTICES.

Absence from the Lord's Table. Chadwick	228
Abyssinia and its Apostle. Lady Herbert	371
Account of Sandford. Marshall ..	92
Akers' "Letter to my Flock" ..	371
Altar Songs, C. Dix	384
Anglican Conference, The. R. Trywhitt	90

Page
Appeal to High Churchmen .. 95
Argyle's (Bp. of) Pamphlets .. 468
Attraction of Jesus Christ Crucified. Liddon 368
Baird's Sermons at S. Gabriel's .. 88
Baptism of Christ. O. B. Tyler .. 367
Battle of the Faith, The. E. Husband 370
Bennett's (W. J. E.) Letter to Dr. Pusey 374
Bickersteth's (Archdeacon) Charge 474
British Churchman, The 93
Burgon's Short Sermons 90
Burton's (Dr.) Thoughts on Separation of Church and State .. 573
Canons of the First Four Councils, The 89, 286
Capetown's (Bishop of) Statement 92
Carter's (T. T.) Sermon at the Consecration of Dr. Harris .. 376
Catechetical Lectures. Hessey 92
Catholic Unity. E. Stuart .. 90
Catholic Tracts. E. Husband 95, 478
Ceremonial Detail, &c. 573
Chasuble, The, etc. 95
Chester's (Dean of) Discourse .. 90
Children's Bread, The. Littledale 377
Choice Notes on the Gospel of S. Matthew 372
Christian Unity. Dykes 479
Christian Warfare. Eliot .. 373
Christ and Antichrist. Manning 90
Christ's Mystical Body. Floyd .. 476
Church Association. Osborne .. 286
Church's Broken Unity. Bennett 96, 286, 374
Church Ballads 191, 573
Church and Society, The. S. B. James 89
Church in the Army, The.. .. 364
Church News, The.. 92
Church of the Fathers, The. Newman 372
Church, the Sacraments and the Ministry, The. W. R. Clark 93
Church of God, On the, etc. Colin Lindsay 95
Church-rate Legislation. Longman and Harvey 368
Churchman's Companion, The .. 96
Civilization and Religion. Church 377
Clarke's (Rochfort) Letter .. 369
Clerke's (Archdeacon) Charge .. 379
Commentary on the Articles. Bp. Forbes 92
Convent Prize Book, The.. .. 192
Cosin's Devotions 89
Curious Myths. Baring Gould .. 88
Daily Readings. Wilkinson .. 372
Daily Sacrifice, The 470
Daily Devotions. Archd. Clerke 288
Daily Celebration, The. Liddell.. 373
Day Hours of the Church of England, The.. 373
Devotional Readings. Manning.. 373
Dis-establishment of the Theocracy, The. Dean Hook 470
Divided House, The. Tollemache 367
Divine Teacher, The 89
Doctrine of Indulgences, The. Sarra 371
Edith Sydney. F. M. Oxenham.. 186
English Orders and Papal Supremacy. Bailey.. 370
English Church Union, Letters on the 365
Evening Rest 371
Evils Days. W. Stubbs 91
Experiences of Forty Years .. 475
Family Prayers with Psalter. Lord Nelson.. 91
Family Prayers. Moultrie .. 375
Flowers and Festivals. Barrett.. 191
Form for admitting Readers .. 287
Fourteen Letters to Zachary Pearce. Archd. Churton .. 574
Gate of Paradise, The 370
Gift of the Priesthood, The. Williams 478
Golden Grove, The.. 475
Gospeller, The 475
Grant's (Sir R.) Poems 285
Handy Book of Floral Decoration 89
Hints on the Management of Sunday Schools. Prynne.. 371, 475
Historical Religion, etc. Harris 94
Holy Child, and other Poems, The. Jenner.. 89
Home for Christmas 573
Honolulu's (Bishop of) Five Years' Work in Hawaii 372
Huntingdon's Sermons 370
Hymns and Poems for the Sick and Suffering. Fosberry .. 371
Ignorance of foolish men .. 367
Imitation of Christ, The.. .. 88
Inheritance of our Fathers, The. Baird 287
Is there not a cause? .. 377, 574
Jebb's (Bp.) Speech 376
Keble's Sermons 96, 375
Kiss of Peace, The 93
Kiss of Peace, Reply to the. Taylor. 94
Lake of Gennesaret. C. Baker .. 288
Lambeth Conference, The. Burgon 90
Law of the Church on Ritual, The. Wordsworth 287
Lay Suggestions on Modern Preachers and Preaching .. 94

Page
Lee's (A. T.) Tract on the Irish Church.. 370
Lee's (F. G.) Letter to Mr. G. Hardy 474, 572
Lee's (F. G.) Sermons 374
Lee's (F. G.) Sermon "The Truth as it is in Jesus" 288
Lessons of Middle Age 94
Liddon's Bampton Lectures .. 480
Life of Faith, The. U. Richards 192
Life of Marie Eustelle Harpain .. 573
Lindsay's (Colin) Address before the E. C. U. 369
Littledale's Lecture on Innovations 372
Liturgical Reason Why. Williams 95
Long Resistance and ultimate Conversion.. 288
Lord Jesus, our Light and Life, The. Parkman 287
Louise Mallac 371
Mackonochie's Sermon 91
Manual for Serving Boys 470
Manual for Confession. Williamson 192
Manual of Pastoral Visitation .. 470
Maturin's Sermon on the Source of the Church's Danger .. 372
Maximilian and other Poems. J. C. Earle 371
Melia's Treatise on the B.V.M. .. 362
Memoirs of the Earls of Granard 469
Meynell's Sermon on the Bishop of Lichfield's Death 91
Miracles and Prophecy. Irons. .. 92
Monthly Packet, The 373
Mystery of Iniquity. Archdeacon Jones 91
Mysteries of Mount Calvary, The 285
Neale's (Dr.) Commentary on the Psalms 574
Neale on Secession 285
New Ground 371
Newman's (Dr.) Sermons.. 374, 574
Noble Aim, A. Mrs. Cudlip .. 285
Notes on Islam. Brinckman. .. 475
Not to be Daunted 573
Oldknow's Sermons 287
On the Education of the Clergy. Michell 575
Order for the Communion of the Sick 371
Organic Unity of the Christian Church. W. P. Smith .. 376
Origin and Progress of Religious Orders. P. Mannock .. 373
Our Curate's Budget 375
Oxford Extension 375
Parish Recollections. Harston .. 372

Page
Parting Counsels. Allen.. .. 96
Peat's Sermon on the Beatitudes.. 286
Peile's Two Sermons 366
People's Hymnal 375
Phillimore (Dr. R.) against the Bishop of London 368
Plain Guide, The 369
Pope and the Church, The. Bottalla 373
Popular Objections to the Prayer Book considered. Goulburn 373
Portuary for the Laity 192
Prayer Book for the Young, The.. 374
Prescott's Short Sermons .. 96
Present Relations of the Church and State in England. Lawrence 192
Principles of Religion. Pagan .. 191
Proceedings at the laying the first stone of the Keble College, The 475
Protestant Directorium, The. Tupper 286
Pye's Four Sermons on the Christian Sacrifice 371
Queen Bertha and her Times .. 287
Recent Secessions and Corporate Re-union 369
Redesdale's (Lord) Speech .. 477
Reformation and Deformation, The 89
Relation of the Anglican Church to the Orthodox 87
Religious Life Portrayed, The. Benson.. 373
Renouf's Condemnation of Pope Honorius 380
Repentance. T. T. Carter .. 191
Resurrections of the Truth. Bishop of Oxford 366
Retrospect of Forty Years. Bishop of Ely 370
Revision of the Lectionary, The, Dr. Neale 288
Rites and Customs of the Græco-Russian Church. Romanoff 480, 569
Ritualism. Auguste Nicolas 286, 365
Rhymer's Wallet, A. Cradock Newton 88
Roman Question, The. Fr. Lockhart 284
Rose's (Archdeacon) Sermon at Great St. Mary's 376
Rule of Faith. Hodges 572
Ryder's Letter to W. G. Ward .. 187
Sanctuaries of the Madonna. Northcote 480
Sarum Missal in English, The .. 288
Scriptural Penitent, The 573
Sermons to a Country Congregation, (third series). E. T. Codd 572

Page

Services of the Church, with Rubrical Directions, according to the Use of the Illustrious Church of Sarum 572
Short Services for Congregational Use. Vaux 574
Short Treatise on the Holy Eucharist. J. R. West 574
S. Thomas à Becket, Life of. Mrs. Hope 475
S. Gregory the Illuminator, Life of. Malan 373
S. Cyprian's Works 474
S. Thomas Aquinas on the Incarnation 374
Songs of the Vineyard. Soper .. 378
Songs of Joy 369
Souls of the Faithful Dead, The. Smith 376
Spiritual Songs. Gerhardt .. 95
Spiritual Combat, The. Scupoli .. 375
Stories on the Festivals 191
Story of the Kings of Judah and Israel 372
Sunday Stories for the Christian Year 375, 573

Page

Taylor's Holy Living and Dying 283
Tertullian's Treatise against Marcion 474
Third Report of the E. C. A. .. 474
Three Legends of the Early Church. Reithmüller 191
Twenty Years at S. Matthew's, City Road 572
Two Lectures on Monasticism .. 573
Union and Dis-union. C. Le Geyt 91
Urquhart's Appeal of a Protestant 376
Verses on Various Occasions. Newman 182
What are the true Principles and Doctrines of the Church of England? 368
What constitutes a Church? Williams 91
Who's Who; or the Three Brothers 371
Worcester's (Bishop of) Charge .. 372
Words of the Graduals, &c. .. 470
Wordsworth's (Bp.) Catechesis... 571
Wordsworth's Sermon on the Punishment of Death .. 90
Young's (Sir C.) Lecture on the Reformation 478

THE UNION REVIEW.

ART. I.—ENGLISH IGNORANCE OF WORSHIP.

WHEN the Conference of Theologians recommended in the recent volume of *Essays on Re-Union* shall be held, it will be found that a large amount of the misunderstanding between England and Rome has arisen from misconception (principally on our side) of the meaning and nature of the term Worship. It is a word that has been used in a loose and indefinite sense until it popularly even includes the idea of instruction in religion. Most people would think they had "attended public worship" if they had been to hear a sermon, even if it were an University sermon, or an open-air preaching. We talk of the "place of worship" of sects, Quakers and the like, who have no worship at all, and there are probably scarcely half-a-dozen members of the English Church who do not fancy that praying to God is worshipping Him. Then, when they find that which is their highest service to the Supreme Being, and their most exalted notion of that which is His due, given by foreign Catholics to the Saints, how can they escape from the conviction that the Saints are receiving honour due to God alone, and are placed in a position which He alone can occupy? From this primary misconception of worship the ordinary Englishman sees no difference between the *Ora pro nobis*, (which he would not hesitate to say to our Lord Himself), and the wildest act of adoration which the foreigner's misconception of the same word has impelled him to address to our Lady. In the Englishman's eyes, it is all idolatry together, and from his point of view, justly so. The fault lies in the degraded and degrading nature of his point of view. His God is practically a man, instead of a God Incarnate. He nominally prays to God the Father, but when he realises to himself the Being that is the object of his worship, he thinks of our Lord,

and it is to his God and Saviour that the deepest feelings of his heart are outpoured. As his views of that Saviour become more and more unsound, and his intellectual power of conceiving of a God rises higher, he gradually perceives that the Man whom he takes as his example is not a fit object for "worship," and so arise Rationalism and Colensoism. An abstract idea of a beneficent and Almighty Father becomes his sole notion of the only spiritual Being to whom he ever speaks; and this, from his having ceased to acknowledge any infallible teacher becomes more and more uncertain and dreamy, until at last in Pantheism or Atheism he sinks his last idea of a Personal God. We have seen this decline and fall of faith in many instances in one generation, and some of us have begun to perceive that to give *due* honour and veneration to the saints, so far from interfering with that which should be given to God, actually preserves the devotion offered to Him from sinking to that which we may lawfully give to a finite being. We say the due honour, because excess in this has its perils on the other side, and lands the educated and discerning mind no less surely in Rationalism, by first inducing a belief that all spiritual beings are almost equally powerful, and then all equally powerless.

The *Record* has been greatly scandalised by the Bishop of Dunedin's statement that there has been no real worship in the English Church for the last 300 years, and it is a saying which might astonish many. "What!" they might ask, "has there been no real heartfelt prayer or praise offered to God in public for centuries past?" We fear there has not been much even of this, but if there had been, it is not *worship*, according to the teaching of the Church Catholic, and therefore of the Church of England also. She distinctly teaches the contrary. "My duty towards God is to . . . . worship Him, to give Him thanks, to put my whole trust in Him, to call upon Him, to honour His holy Name and His word." Here worship is distinguished both from "giving Him thanks," and from "calling upon Him," with both of which it is hopelessly confused, even by those who have ceased to believe that hearing a sermon is worship. The essential idea of worship probably is that it is an offering of adoration from the creature to the Creator, irrespective of any benefit to be received by the creature. It may be and is accompanied by prayer and thanksgiving, but they are totally subordinate to the principal idea. True worship is therefore an act, and should be appointed by God Himself, if we would be assured that it is acceptable. Now the act of

worship which God has ordained for fallen man, from the beginning of the world to the end, is the act of Sacrifice. It was the offering, first of a symbol of the Incarnate Son of God, and afterwards and for ever of Himself in reality. This it is which we have lost for so many hundred years. The form of offering the Sacrifice has indeed been gone through, and doubtless it has been accepted on behalf of its unconscious offerers, but they have come to it with other ideas and intentions, which though true, were far short of the truth. English people have come to their Eucharistic service to receive a gift and not to offer one. Self, not God, has been their object. True, it was the highest of all blessings that they sought, and one that it was a duty to seek, but the creature owes its Creator another and far higher duty than to treat Him only as a Bestower of benefits. The worship described at the Heavenly Altar is adoration of God for His own perfections, and we, in our long misunderstood great act of worship, avail ourselves of the very words which that Vision has supplied to the Church below, that she may learn here, however feebly, to join in the worship of the Church above, upon which indeed the value of her own depends. "We give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory."

Ritualism has restored this worship among us, and by vestments and ceremonial has made it manifest that we come to the Altar to offer adoration which it would be blasphemy to offer to any but Almighty God. Body and soul, heart and intellect, prostrate themselves like the women on the first Easter morning at the feet of their risen Lord, and worship Him. There could have been no prayer, no thanksgiving in that act, but pure adoration of Death's Conqueror, and glad welcome of His restored Presence. Prayer and thanksgiving do indeed accompany our act of worship, but they are not of its essence, although many who have long been truly Catholic in their creed cannot easily divest themselves of the idea that they are, which has grown up with them from childhood. There have been those who, when first present at a "Ritualistic" service, have felt that they had never before been even present at the worship of God, and had never really worshipped Him in their lives.

When once the true idea is mastered, we remember that, though new to us, it has been familiar to all foreign Catholics from their babyhood, and we find less difficulty in understanding their statement that they do not confuse the worship due to God with the honours they pay to saints. It would be well if the word "worship" were henceforth confined to the adoration

given to God alone. We know, that not so very many years ago, English people were quite able to understand, that, as applied to human beings, it had no idolatrous meaning, as when our translation of the Bible spoke of the Jews as worshipping the Lord and the king. It was understood then to mean any act of veneration or reverence from an inferior to a superior, and its various degrees were assumed to be adapted to the dignity of the being worshipped; but it is doubtful whether it could again be so used without conveying a false and confusing meaning. Moreover, it is not only a question of words but of fact. The worship due to God alone has unquestionably been given to our Lady by some. The words of the *Gloria Patri* are an ascription of glory alone due to the Supreme Being, and to say, as they have done in Spain, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, and to the Virgin Mary, as it was in the beginning," &c., is deliberately to pay divine honour to a creature, beside involving a gross heresy. Still, putting aside these and other such corruptions, which all true members of the Roman Communion abhor as much as we do ourselves, we have more to learn than they to unlearn, and we must learn it as we can, and not as we cannot, and we shall best learn it by having different words to express different ideas. God forbid that we should ever be less jealous for His honour than we are now, or while we give Him so little of His due, that we should attempt to divide it with His creatures. We have to learn as a nation what worship means, and that it is to be, in part at least, that which will last for ever, which will outlive prayer and surpass thanksgiving, and will lose all consciousness of self in the Being it adores.

It is ignorance of this which lies at the root of the present, or, we may say now, the late, popular outcry against the Ritualistic rendering of the Communion Office. Uninstructed people perceive that the service is somehow totally changed, and that they cannot follow it as they have been accustomed. It is not addressed to them, or read for their benefit, and they want teaching that there is no need for them to "follow" it at all. There is their Lord, as Offerer, Offering, and Gift, and they are free to concentrate their affections and devotion upon Him in either aspect and in any form. There is much practical belief in the Real Presence yet remaining among our people, evidenced by their fear of receiving the Blessed Sacrament. What possible harm it could do them to take part in a simple act of memorial, even if they were conscious of being unworthy, they would find it difficult to explain. But

that there is "something" there which will hurt them in a way quite distinct from the way in which hypocritical prayer, for instance, would hurt them, is their unconscious testimony to a Presence which in words they may deny. After all, the teaching of the Catechism goes deeper than the teaching of the popular Protestantism of late years. But a belief in some sort of Real Presence does not popularly include the idea of a Personal Presence. The belief is in a Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord apart, in some way, from Himself, and therefore the worship of Him there present does not naturally occur to the ordinary English Churchman. This we have to teach, and afterwards to show him what is his duty to the God Who so comes to meet him.

Certainly, howsoever we learn these things and teach them, we do not gain our knowledge from Roman Catholics. Their present policy seems to be to despise us for our ignorance and still more for our knowledge, taking care to point out the first in the most repelling manner, and always to speak of the second as either inaccurate or else a sham. We are more likely to learn our lesson thoroughly by logically deducing each step for ourselves, than by accepting it like children from teachers who would be for us unauthorized; but we had a right to expect from our fellow Christians more help in learning the truth than we have received, even had we been the unhappy outcasts which it has pleased the Roman authorities to consider us. The contemptuous instruction which they do occasionally vouchsafe to throw at us is left unread by the great majority of English learners, and even if read, would defeat its own ends. Can it really be supposed that any of us could be won, could be otherwise than repelled, for instance, by such publications as "The Knight of the Faith?" The idea is altogether so insane, that the form in which these tracts are advertised, "To be had from the Author, Hanwell," sounds like an unconscious satire. Contempt is not an effective engine in missionary work, nor are the increasing coarseness and vulgarity which characterize more and more every day the Ultramontane attacks on the Catholic Revivalists likely to do their cause anything but harm. In the subject we are now considering, what help have we ever received in learning the true nature of worship? Absolutely none, until we found it out for ourselves, and then an attempt is made first to demonstrate that we have no part in anything except the "worship" we are just learning to repudiate, and then to insult us with sneers at our deficiency. Recently it has seemed advisable to the *Weekly Register* to

exhibit the worthlessness of our Communion Office by a pretended comparison of it with the Roman Mass, in an article which would have been intensely ludicrous, if it had not been so profane. We leave such attacks to receive their own reward, and only call attention to them as a sign of the changing character of the controversy. It is just as it was about the Confessional clamour. At first assailants used arguments, such as they were; and gentlemen spoke strongly, but like gentlemen. By degrees the opposition passed to a lower and a lower class, till the meetings held about the Poole Case showed the scurrility and indecency which were really at the root of the anti-confessional riots, and from that time persons with any character to lose have left them to the low class who delight in impurity. In a somewhat similar manner vulgar abuse and scornful epithets are taking the place of real controversy on the ultra-Roman side, and every week the arguments grow feebler and the epithets stronger. A little while ago we were told that Anglo-Catholics were doing the work of the Roman priests for them; now we are told that they are the bitterest enemies of Catholicism, and that "no honest man can ever join hands with the workers of this great deception." Those who hold us out the smallest encouragement are the "black sheep" of their own communion, and we who maintain the English Church to be Catholic are guilty of "a dishonest sin." To themselves doubtless all this seems like righteous indignation, but to those who are accustomed to study the history of controversy it indicates that when abuse is resorted to it has become the most telling weapon then remaining to the adversary who employs it. For this unconscious admission these attacks are valuable, but they are likely to be effective in no other way.

A recent article in the *Westminster Gazette*, while partly touching on the true nature of worship, and assuming that none but Roman Catholics know anything about it, also endeavours to demonstrate that, being an act of worship, it is therefore much better to be in a tongue the people do not understand. It is difficult to see how there can be any advantage in their not comprehending the words, though there may be advantage in liberating the worshippers from that strain on the attention which words spoken for their benefit demand. But the office said to God and not to man, completely obviates this objection, while the benefit to the people of knowing what the priest is saying, and what they may join in saying if they please, would at all events justify a translation being placed in their hands.

Among ourselves, the prejudices of our people, and the precision of the national mind, would under all circumstances hinder them from entering into an Office in a foreign tongue. We are not so constituted that we could content ourselves with the act of worship, and take it for granted that the unknown words meant something good with which we need not trouble ourselves. The inaction of mind and preponderance of imagination and feeling which this would imply, are foreign and not English characteristics. We have set far too much store by the share that the intellect can take in worship, but it is an equal mistake to make no arrangement for its exercise in a part of our duty towards God which is capable of drawing out its loftiest powers.

With some few favoured exceptions, we have to learn and to teach others, especially the uneducated, how to worship. Most, of course, is to be done with the children of our schools, in explaining to them the Catechism and Eucharistic Office, which last should be made a far more prominent part of their teaching than it has been hitherto. We need an easy book for them and for the poor, to teach them how to join in offering the Sacrifice, and how to adapt It to their own wants and needs. We have as yet no satisfactory book even for the educated, none, that is, which will bear to be used day after day.

Pictures also would be a great help to children and the unlearned, but a descent into the symbolic details of every part of the Mass would scarcely commend itself to the English poor. If the book confined itself to the presentation of the two main ideas in various forms, that our Lord Himself is there, and that this is the Offering of the Sacrifice made on Calvary, the few thoughts that they can put together would centre themselves round these, and if they could get no further, they would yet have a blessed feeling that they had met our Lord and spoken to Him, and that they had offered to God the Father something worthy even of His acceptance, an offering which could not fail to be recompensed by the Giver of all good. Few writers of books and sermons intended for the uneducated have the least idea how dense their minds are, and how incomprehensible to them are statements which the authors fancy so very clear. The very plainest deduction they require to have put into words for them, and their consciences are far from responding easily when sins that they commit daily are spoken of. Nothing can be too simple, and too great an amount of ignorance can scarcely be assumed in dealing with the uneducated

poor. It is not meant to imply that all the poor are uneducated. Many a begrimed workman is an educated man; badly educated, and taught to reason falsely, but still as much recognising an appeal to his intellect as a philosopher, though often more hopeless to argue with. But he, too, must start with the same primary idea that his duty to God requires from him worship, and that God has appointed the way in which He desires to be worshipped. He will probably worship more intelligently than the boor, but the faith and love which make worship acceptable can exist in minds perhaps incapable of one clear and definite idea on subjects of which the senses cannot take cognizance.

As soon as man believes in a God at all, the idea of worship seems to come to him in some form naturally. Few savage nations are without ideas of worship and sacrifice, however distorted and superstitious may be the rite, and however degraded the being they call a god. In many instances the failure of English missionaries has arisen from their endeavouring to destroy a false worship without substituting the true. They changed the act into an intellectual exercise, and required from the undeveloped understanding that it should address elaborate supplications to a Being Whom it could not see and might not picture. The instinctive adhesion to worship as an act forms an overpowering attraction to idolatry, and the new system is not sufficiently grasped by the intellect to call that faculty into exercise. Then we wonder at the failure of our missionaries, and redouble our vain attempts to reach the darkened mind. In England we have not, unfortunately, the negative unbelief of the savage, but that grosser and more obstinate unbelief which can only exist in a baptised and degenerated Christian. The heathen is often glad to hear that there is something better in store for him after death than the future his creed holds out to him, but the neglected Englishman has no time to give to such thoughts, and only wants something which will make his life more comfortable now. "*God will not expect too much of a poor man.*" This is too often the beginning and end of his creed. It satisfies his dull conscience in life, and it sustains his last hours, when his mind, instead of brightening, is generally increasingly stupefied.

The usual way of dealing with such persons is to try and rouse in them a sense of sin and a need of repentance, and generally without success. A few gifted men, with great command over the emotions of others, can awake the slumbering perceptions, but the usual result is dogged indifference.

Might we not hope that the primary idea of an act of worship due from the creature to his Creator would be more easily instilled to begin with, involving as it does far less pain? Of course it would be a vital mistake to stop there, and a mistake which is too often made. This service being rendered, conformity to God's holy law is sometimes allowed to be regarded as a secondary and unnecessary branch of Christian duty. Worship and crime do unfortunately co-exist in Catholic countries, but such a state of things indicates a defect in the teaching just as much as the complete absence of worship among ourselves. From the nature of the English character, and its down-right one-thing-or-the-other standard both in good and evil, we might hope to escape any great amount of inconsistency. We should have effected a great improvement in an ungodly man's life, if we brought him to make *any* sort of offering to God, and it would have a beneficial effect in drawing out the first beginnings of love. It is a deep knowledge of human nature that recommends us if we wish to become fond of a person, to do him a kindness, and it is a yet deeper truth that our love to God is more likely to grow from doing something for Him than from any amount of favours asked and granted. For at an early stage in the growth of spiritual life in the soul, there is a sense in which it is more blessed to give than to receive, if only we enter into the depth of the words, "All things come of Thee, and of Thine OWN have we given Thee."

Art. II.—CHURCH MUSIC.

[COMMUNICATED.]

Church Music is the true handmaid of Ritual; for not only does it submit to its order, and yield to its will, but it reflects perceptibly its dignity, or it may be its carelessness and slovenliness. Does Ritual put on her robes of beauty, and adorn herself with every grace to welcome the coming of her Lord? Music is conspicuous in her train, moving with stateliest measure, and chanting with grandeur her ancient strains. Is Ritual sensuous, and tricked out merely to catch the idle fancy of men? Music at once imitates her mistress, and warbles love-tunes, or flaunts meretricious hymns. If Ritual is slovenly, a careless jade, indifferent whether her Master be present or not, then music is seen to content herself with a few uncomely shreds of Tate and Brady as a covering for her naked poverty. But Church Music has also a direct relation to Church Doctrine; for where there is found to be a disbelief in the Presence of Christ in His Sacraments, or a decay in reverence for God's House, there the character of the music is proportionately deteriorated; so that a history of the decline of Church Music since the Reformation may easily be read as a history of the decline of Catholic belief within the Church.

At the beginning of the Reformation, the instinct (for such it may be called) of Catholic doctrine clung to the musicians of the "new-religion," and, therefore, their compositions are chaste, pure, and glorious, though, like the Prayer-Book from which they drew their new inspiration, wanting in the fervour and unction of ancient days; but the art soon began to feel the effect of Protestant inundation,—lower and lower it sinks as the tide of inevitable Calvinism rises, till at last Bathos is reached, and Cathedral choirs went into ecstacies over Cecil's "I will arise;" or the inspiring composition of R. Smith, "How Beautiful upon the Mountains."

"Services" had descended from the sublimity of Tallis's *Te Deum* to the profundity of Jackson's. Hymn Tunes, once upon a time grand and ennobling, could reach no lower depth of degradation than Devizes and New Cambridge, which were the compositions most in vogue forty years ago. There was, indeed, an upward movement at the end of the seventeenth century, and a bright gleam of hope illumined the Church when Blow, Purcell, Aldrich, and Croft, lived and wrote; but

the superiority of their writings in true Church tone, was no doubt due, in the case of Purcell, to the chastening fire of a long persecution; in that of the others, to the high doctrine of the age of the non-jurors, and the indirect influence of James II. in a Catholic direction. In those days, when young men, they received the vivid and ineffaceable impressions which youth alone can receive, and a true direction was given to their musical talent; but the rising to the surface, the little gasping for breath is soon over, for the faith of the Church of William of Orange is not sufficient to keep them up, and Weldon leads the downward course, followed by Greene, Kent, Clarke, Whitfeld, and others. Good enough musicians (two at least,) but with scarce a spark of Catholic spirit or grave devotion in their hearts.

This is the point that so strikingly exemplifies our remark that ecclesiastical music depends for its perfection on the appreciation of Church doctrine. The revival of music as a science had no effect upon Church music: it made, indeed, musicians write better compositions; but these it could not of itself make one whit more Catholic in tone. Kent could go on writing his interminable effusions, and facetiously clung to the old word "verse" anthem as a happy definition of their character; but neither name nor secular talent could make the reality. The stupendous genius of Handel did indeed break through all trammels, and soar to the very Heavens; but his ignorance of Catholic truth is still perceptible in his writings, or rather he wrote nothing where it might be displayed for oratorios: his greatest achievements were never intended to be more than religious operas,—as such they were composed, and as such they will remain. In their proper place they have the grandest effect, but, except in the case of one or two pieces, and these chiefly choral, the introduction of oratorio music into Churches not only does the music injustice, from the poverty of the orchestra, but causes the impression that the piece sung is intended solely to display the quality of the boy's voice, or the perfection of the choir. Against the encouragement of which impressions in the House of God, we cannot too stoutly dub ourselves "Protestant."

The revival of sound Church Music must undoubtedly be ascribed to the late revival of Church principles. When Oxford dealt the death-blow to Protestantism, Cambridge dug the grave of secular ecclesiastical music; and to the Church of the present day is left the task of filling in the earth, and removing from sight every relic of the departed.

The Camden Society's works, *The Parish Choir and the*

Psalter Noted, effected a wonderful transformation in our parish churches; but we should bear in mind that florid anthems, trifling double chants, and other such music of the day were everywhere denounced by our clergy, not so much because they were, musically speaking, unfit to be sung; but because it was found that the feelings of devout minds were outraged by their irreverence and want of devotional effect. We look back with a sort of grim satisfaction to those stirring days of violent change and fiery conflict, when from one end of England to the other, the clergy, single-handed, were found waging a hard battle with stubborn choirs of women, contumacious churchwardens, traditional parish-clerks, and incompetent organists, with but a dim prospect before them of victory; but inch by inch they fought their way to the chancel, and that citadel gained for their surpliced choir, the battle was practically won. The congregational responses now everywhere heard, and the hearty hymns, testify to the value of the victory.

The revival of Church Music has been called above a "movement;" and perhaps inquisitive readers may ask the pertinent questions, Whence? and Where? What were the defects in the music of the time? What is the state of perfection to which we are supposed to be approaching? Now, to answer these questions properly, it would be necessary to enter into a long disquisition concerning the special characteristics which distinguish sacred from secular music. Then to shew where our former music was lacking in sacred character, and to point out its direct violation of the canon of rules laid down under the first head; and thirdly, to adduce evidence that the professions of reform which have lately been made in numerous Churches, without, however, any perceptible movement towards our ideal perfection, may justly be considered, speaking musically, as instances of "suspended resolutions," leading to a canonical "progression,"—a point rather difficult to prove. But far be it from your lot, worthy readers, to read, or ours to write, so dreary and distasteful a treatise; yet that we may not be turned from our course by so truculent a three-headed monster, perhaps a few short remarks of the simplest character may serve as a sop to Cerberus.

The special characteristics of Church Music may be defined to be grandeur, gravity, fervour,—a rare combination of excellences, which requires the genius of a master to effect; and, therefore, it is frequently said that a simple psalm tune may give sufficient proof of the ability of a composer,—for a mere worker by rule, though he may be correct in his concords,

will be lacking in fervour: a shallow writer can never attain to gravity; and the grandeur of a small genius sinks to its proper insignificance when the support of bombastic stilts is removed. Unless these three distinguishing characteristics exist in a very marked degree in any composition, it will never receive the continued approval of the Church;—for a time, indeed, it may be popular, and people will be found to delight in Ewing's *Jerusalem the Golden,* Hursley or Jackson's *Te Deum*; but very soon even the popular taste sickens of such things, and they sink into the oblivion from which they had no right ever to proceed.

The reason of the utter disgust with which we speak of last century's music arises entirely from its painful secularity. Anthems were written in what was called a light and graceful style; but they pall upon our ears now as frivolous and undevotional. Hymn tunes were written to "suit the popular taste," it was said; and though they were sung most uproariously by the bass singers in the organ-loft, they now only remind us of the rat-a-tat of a drum, or the refrain of a tavern song,—they did not possess one trait of holy psalmody, and they have deservedly been banished from even the worst tune books of the present day. But if we run our eye over the accepted music of the Church, which gains more in our affections the oftener it is sung, we shall find it marked in a special by a peculiar grandeur, gravity, and fervour. The Gregorian tones delight more and more every day, as we chant the Psalter, and yet they never remind us of the world without the Church. The ancient hymn tunes, or such grand music as Tallis' *Evening Hymn, The Old Hundredth,* and other chorales, never recall the opera to our minds, and the rich, harmonious anthems of Gibbon, Tye, Farrant, and others, lift up our thoughts to the worship of heavenly choirs, and the holy music of angelic song. Musicians of eminence have undoubtedly taken a strong stand against Gregorian music, but only on account of its want of harmony—they complain of no deficiency in its sacred character. Were it intended to exclude modern music from our churches, and to supply its place with those works of early days when art was in its infancy, the complaints of Ouseley and others would be fully justified, and no greater calamity could well befall us; for any system of religion which discourages the culture of the fine arts, or refuses to incorporate into its system the gradually increasing knowledge of centuries, must be based upon a false foundation, and will soon fall to the ground; but the true lovers of Gregorian music are far from wishing to exclude

other compositions. All they assert is, that for congregational singing, especially in the Psalter, the ancient tunes are of wondrous power, and that they will not throw away needlessly sterling music, which still does its duty well, and has the immense advantage of a great antiquity.

If we consider the "uses" of Church Music, as well as its "characteristics," we shall find that there is no need of either ancient music being forgotten, or of modern compositions being thrust aside;—it is only when Gregorianizers on the one hand, or Harmonists on the other, take up exclusive theories, that there is seen to be any difficulty in the combination of both styles. Thanksgiving, of which music is the expression, is a sacrifice; and, therefore, like all other sacrifices, must contain both an offering and a participation.

In the Sacramental Eucharistia, our Lord first gave to His Apostles the blessed privilege of participation, and on the following day they were present at His offering on the Cross. The Church gives a like privilege to her children by the practice of Low and High Masses, so that time may be obtained to meditate upon each part of the Holy Sacrifice. In Thanksgiving, generally, the same distinction is drawn: it is called the "calves of our lips,"—a strong sacrificial expression, reminding us of ministering servants, who make the offering, and of the people's participation. Hence, as a congregation, we should join with our lips in the praises and hymns which are sung; and in the offering of anthems and other elaborate music we should give to God, at the hands of ministering choristers, the best offering that we can procure.

The Church, therefore, while she encourages congregational psalmody as much as possible, gives full scope also to the powers of genius, and hails every fresh discovery in musical science with ever-increasing satisfaction, as an enrichment of her offering to the glory of God.

Let us make a few remarks on the present state of Church Music in the Church of England, pointing out, as we go along, its intimate connection with doctrinal opinion.

The religious services of our Cathedrals are now remarkable for the purity of the music, and the excellency of the voices of the singers. No pains seem to be spared in striving after artistic perfection in all that pertains to the musical rendering of the daily Matins and Evensong,—the anthems and services are exquisite, and the organ accompaniment superb.

Thus, much honour must be allowed to the authorities of our Cathedrals by every impartial critic; and the large congregation of *respectable* people which assemble, at least on Sundays,

show that the care taken in conducting so much of the public worship as the Dean and Chapter think necessary for edification, is not unappreciated.

Our praise can, we are sorry to say, extend no further. The slovenly processional, the indecent behaviour of the choristers, the careless worship of the congregation,—all show a lack of religious reverence which is painful in the extreme. The special deficiencies of these services are, the exclusion of the people from any participation in the daily worship, and the complete degradation of the office of the Holy Eucharist in a musical point of view.

The office of the canonical hours, of which our Matins and Evensong are a condensation, is, by its structure, congregational in character. It may be doubtful whether it is serviceable for the use of the lower orders; but whether it is said only by priests, or be adapted for the common prayer of the people, it is manifestly against all ancient use and common sense to confine its utterance to a few in the congregation. In ancient times, when the laity were content to frequent Mass as sufficient for their morning devotional wants, the monks and clergy of our cathedrals and minsters used to assemble within the rood, or in their private chapel, and sing lustily the Psalms and versicles of the Hours, as an additional exercise of devotion, becoming men called to a holy life;—the plain song was easily learned, and daily practice in the Psalter made its correct pointing appear almost natural. Hence, for such as attended these services, they were eminently congregational.

The abolition of monasteries, and the appointment of paid laics to fulfil the duties of the religious, together with the practice of attendance by the people at the newly-appointed Matins, completely transformed the character of the Divine office. The people, as a general rule, could attend Church for any length of time only on Sundays, and so knew little of the newly-translated Psalter,—they were, therefore, compelled to listen, instead of singing; and as hymns were given up because none could be found to translate them, the choir soon found that it had everything to itself, and with a natural desire of doing credit to their profession, the lay-clerks began to use music more difficult than that which the larger bodies of monks could formerly have attempted; and so the congregation was completely shut out from all audible participation in the worship. In the Holy Eucharist, where there is so much objective worship, no great harm would have happened by this development of the musical services; but in mere chanting and psalm-singing, which is an entirely subjective occupation, the

consequence has been, as we have said above, disastrous. The congregation has lost all interest in the service;—they criticize the singers, which is the only objective point that they can lay hold of in the performance, and are careless and indifferent worshippers. In no church or chapel in the world,—in no worship of Hindoo or Mahometan, is there less devotion seen than in an English Cathedral, where a bowed knee is almost an unknown posture to the crowded audience.

To one who has attended a service at Westminster Abbey, there is nothing more painful than to notice the closed lips of the boys of Westminster School. From day to day, and week to week, they are doomed to the same unbroken silence, which must have the effect of chilling their young hearts, and of making religion appear a mere matter of form, and compulsory attendance; or they may think that religion consists in fine singing and unending monotone, which are at all times offensive to the joyous temperament of a boy. Much better would it be for them to be allowed to frequent the lowest evangelical church in the city, where revival prayer-meetings and unctuous hymns would give some play to their youthful affections, rather than to have the religious life of these little ones stunted and frost-bitten by the cold chill of Cathedral propriety.

What we would advocate, therefore, in the Matins and Evensong of a cathedral is a due admixture of the congregational element. Let the present elaborate music be retained; but let the service be interspersed with chorales or hymn tunes suitable to the wants and ability of a congregation. The volume of sound which would result from the voices of a joyous multitude, united in common praise, would be worthy of the grandeur of those noble temples, and would effect a transformation in the character of the assembly. It would no longer be an audience of irreverent hearers, itching after the performance of soli and intricate quartettes, but a congregation of attentive worshippers, glad to take their proper part in the service, and listening with due reverence to the offering of praise which others were privileged to make in their name. Ritual, of course, ought not to be forgotten; but it need not be very pronounced in this service of the Hours, which should be made as popular and congregational as possible. A decent processional might be introduced, and cassocks and cottas used by the choristers to induce proper reverence; but except on grand occasions, the pomp of Ritual should be reserved for the Eucharist.

The second defect in the musical services of our cathedrals which we have pointed out, is its degradation of the Commu-

nion Office. This is a fact so notorious, that we shall not dwell upon it, only remarking that the conduct of those who appoint the music of a Sunday Morning Service is very strange. In those portions of the service where they allow the congregation to be present, they appoint music so difficult that it is impossible to be sung by the masses, and so they become indifferent worshippers; but where they appoint easy music, or rather allow none at all, they take care to drive the people out of church, so that they shall not have a *chance* to join if they should wish to do so.

This strange conduct, though (except on the plea of custom,) inexcusable, is not unaccountable. The music of the High Mass has been ignored, because the doctrine of the Eucharist has been obscured. Such of the Reformers as were ultra-Calvinistic or Zwinglian in their belief wished the Holy Eucharist to be considered as a "participation:" they denied the complement of a Eucharist a holy sacrificial "offering," and wisely, therefore, they never partook of the Lord's Supper except with the well-known customs and ritual of Low Mass. This simple fact accounts for the departure of the people in the midst of the service, contrary to the wording and intention of the Rubric. So long as music was used, all present, familiar with ancient custom, thought it right to remain in church, as at High Mass; but the cessation of music after the Nicene Creed was a natural intimation that they should retire, as the service was to be that of a Low Mass, at which non-communicants were not obliged to be present, and they were already wearied with the length of the service.

The wily Jesuitical Bucers thus completely gained the day, and the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist was well nigh lost to the Church of England for ever, merely by a little clever manœuvring with the musical services. How truly is our assertion borne out that the "History of the Decline of Music" is a history of the decline of doctrine.

The performance of elaborate music at Matins was purposely encouraged by these same Reformers, in order that it might be accepted as an equivalent for the "Popish High Mass." A grand service in the middle of the day was customary to the people; and lest they should complain of its deprivation, they allowed Matins to take the place of the Eucharist. They fed the people with husks, instead of wheat, and the result has been what might have been expected. The life of High Mass has been found to consist, not in the grandeur of the music, but in the efficacy of the sacrificial offering. When the soul of the mid-day service departed, the musical framework lost

its vivacity,—its power was dead; and though Matins, as a subjective exercise of devotion, was of benefit to the learned and intellectual, it could not retain the love or reverence of the people.

But this manœuvre of the Puritans, strange to say, disarmed the Catholics. These had struggled hard in the Church's cause; but after obtaining the overthrow of Edward the Sixth's Second Book, they were glad to rest satisfied with that of Elizabeth, even as used by the Calvinistic party, on the following grounds.

1. As regards Cathedrals.

They knew that it was hopeless to expect two celebrations in one day to be held in any of them; and, therefore, if there was to be but one, it was certainly better that it should be a Low Mass, at which many would from custom communicate, than a High Mass, which did not invite communicants so readily. Again, the Puritan practice secured a high celebration, as far as the oblation in the Militant Prayer, and thus the Eucharist offering was preserved in part to all right-minded Catholics, who, under the circumstances, would endeavour to combine in one service those two essentials of the commemoration of His death, which Christ, in His divine wisdom, had separated by a considerable interval.

2. As regards parish churches, where, as a general rule, there could be but one Priest. In this case, the insertion of the Rubric that the Communion Service might be read as far as the end of the Church Militant Prayer was an advantage which, no doubt, the Catholic party prized highly.

It was against all Catholic custom that a Priest should communicate more than once a day, except on the higher festivals: hence, in most of the parishes of England, as the monasteries were all suppressed, and the Church impoverished, the congregation could only have an early celebration, and no mid-day service, if the old rules were to be observed. But the new Prayer Book supplied in part the deficiency caused by the "*De*formation;" it afforded an opportunity by Matins and Table prayers for an additional service and grace to the people, the best substitute for a High Mass, including a sacrifice of alms, and a commemoration of living and dead, which could be obtained without an absolute consecration, which, as we have said above, could not be made. On the greater festivals the Priest would celebrate in the morning as usual, and then perform High Mass with such accessories of ritual and music as his little parish could manage to supply.

For these reasons, until better days should dawn upon the

Church, the Churchmen of the days of Elizabeth no doubt accepted the improved Prayer Book; but, thanks to the goodness of Providence, the Church of England is not now so ravaged by Puritanism as it used to be; and it is the bounden duty of our Cathedral bodies to return to the ancient rule of early celebrations and full-choral mid-day Mass. Many of our Bishops and Canons believe in the "Real Presence;" they must *show* their belief: "pious opinions," as the belief in the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist used to be called, must ripen at last into true, unswerving faith. The Church will endure no longer a *quasi* denial of Christ before men, but demands a public showing forth of His death till He come. Whatever may become of Matins, the chief place of honour must be given to the memorial of Christ's Sacrifice on the Cross. To this the people will give the deepest reverence, the gravest attention, the highest worship,—no need of furnishing a congregational element in this holy rite: the sacrifice is more than sufficient to secure the raptest devotion. Participation is gone before at the low celebration; and Mozart, Beethoven, and Mendelssohn, must now be called upon to furnish the highest elements of musical excellence to give value to the offering. Introits, Graduals, and Sequences, must again give dignity to our service, and the pomp of Ritual and the sweet savour of incense are demanded to complete our worship. If we consider the character of the music in our parish churches, we shall find that its tendency lies in quite an opposite direction to that of the cathedrals. The congregational element prevails in a very marked degree, and simplicity of music is that which is chiefly aimed after by those who direct the services. The old "Melodia Sacras" are happily become extinct, and Hymnals containing sterling hymns, set to equally good music, are in general use throughout the country. Early celebrations are also become common, while all the dignity possible is given to the high service, where there are several Priests attached to any Church. The gratifying result is perceptible in the marked devotion of the people, their increasing earnestness, and manifest attention to every portion of the service. Even Lord Shaftesbury could only ground his charge of "irreverence" on the fact that *all* did not cross themselves in one of the churches which his curiosity induced him to enter.

It is unnecessary to mention that the daily works of charity, such as visiting the sick and relieving the poor, are the fruits of congregational enthusiasm, and not of cathedralian frigidity. Having thus shown on which side our sympathies lie, and that if a choice is to be made between "all high" music and "all

low," we should feel bound to advocate the latter. It may be allowed us to declare our conviction that either extreme is highly objectionable; but especially do we enter a protest against some of the *very* low stuff which is constantly heard in some of our very high churches. It has often been our unhappy lot to attend these when the service was supposed to be a High celebration, and lights and incense were used without stint; but from the beginning to the end of the performance, music, as a science, has been simply ignored on almost every occasion. In one church not a chord of harmony was heard throughout the service, but one uninterrupted and unending singing in unison went on, till the ear sickened, and hated the very sounds. Even the hymn tunes, which we thought might by chance give us a good bass, were taken up by the thunders of a huge organ, and the treble was played in octaves! Nor was this all: the airs were so secular in character, so grossly sensuous, that we would have hailed with satisfaction the good old tune of "O, Dear, What can the Matter be?" which the Marquis of Westmeath once heard, as an excellent substitute.

Of music, as of everything else, the words of the Psalmist are true, that it is wrong to offer to God that which costs us nothing; nor is it a sufficient excuse to plead that these tunes are popular, and that people sing them. Were it proposed that the care of the altar should be given up to popular taste, and that women should be allowed to substitute tinsel and paper cuttings for the chaste adornment of the altar which now prevails, (Pugin, we all remember, complained bitterly of such a custom in the Roman Church in his day), the Priests, who sanction so-called popular music, would repel the proposition with horror; but, certainly, sham flowers less offend the eye than many of the airs of the "Crown of Jesus" offend the ear, though neither are fit to be used in the worship of God. Music need not be secular in order to be congregational; for *The Old Hundredth*, and innumerable other tunes of a grave and reverent character, will always produce a full volume of sound from the congregation, which will delight the ear of every musician, and will have a much greater devotional effect upon the people than operatic love-songs and adaptations of the "Three Jolly Post-boys."

We are at the present day in the throes of re-action, from former indifference; and, therefore, anything which will induce our congregations to join in the Church services with all their heart will be of benefit, and is excusable for a time; but we may rest assured that secular music, if continued to be sung

in our churches, will in the end show a debased theology, and will certainly tend to produce it.

The airs of which we complain are often introduced, because they are known to be sung in the Roman churches, and therefore, the conclusion is at once made that we shall approach nearer to Catholic doctrine if we drag them into every service. Rome, however, is too wise to allow her people to roar out ranting hymns at High Mass. She confines these choice productions to the *quasi* Compline services at eight o'clock, or perhaps allows them an unrecognized place at Vespers; and from the mere knowledge that they are *then* allowed to be sung, the canon of criticism which we have advanced would lead us to suppose (what is known to be the case), that the Roman Church is not sufficiently careful in guarding her people from sensuous extravagances in matters of lesser moment.

The Holy Eucharist is considered by the Latin Church to be a service of deep awe and reverence;—far from the people being encouraged to shout out popular hymns, even the Priest is required to modify his voice, to denote the stillness of nature on the day of Crucifixion, or when he occasionally uplifts his voice, it is to remind us of the prayer of the penitent thief, and the seven last words of the Blessed Jesus. At High Mass, the Priest assumes his rich vestments, to give value to the offering; and on that account, also, the noblest music is then sung,—music which the people are not expected to give utterance to, because it represents the music of heaven: angels and archangels are present with us at the holy offering, and the noble army of martyrs and ancient worthies, that great cloud of witnesses, (represented by the incense), of which St. Paul bids us take heed, and in their honour the highest praise is offered. Had we the inclination to do so, we could bring forward both argument and proof to show that the present Protestant plan of popular singing at high celebrations tends greatly to obscure the doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice. Matins, Vespers, Compline, and a dozen other services, if necessary, give opportunities of congregational response. On these occasions let it be cultivated as much as possible, and let hymns and spiritual songs be the media for the expression of the people's joy; but the Eucharist is best honoured by adoration and silent meditation.

However much we may object to minor details in its system, we must acknowledge that the Roman Church has a wonderful power in securing the attendance of all classes at its services, and in this the Church of England lamentably fails. It is the Church of the rich and respectable,—the very poor

love the Church, because they have in its clergy warm sympathisers and good friends; but they can seldom be induced to enter the church door;—the smaller shopkeepers are always found to be regular attendants at the neighbouring chapel; but, (unless on the occasion of a baptism or marriage,) they are never seen at the parish church. The services of the Church of England are, as at present conducted in too many places, too intellectual for the great mass of the people, and not sufficiently objective to make them attractive to the ignorant. An attempt to approach nearer to the Roman Catholics in the manner of celebrating High Mass would be of immense service to our Church; and if we could introduce such a little office as is often seen at the Brompton Oratory and other places, where the people seem to have everything their own way, except that a young Priest gives out the hymns, and recites a few Aves and Pater Nosters, the whole being followed by a good extempore sermon, and the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, we should have little cause to complain of the inroads of the Methodists. But whatever music is sung, it ought to be the best of its kind—if Gregorian, then not Parisian; if modern, not operatic. It will often be found advisable to revert at a High Mass to the custom of having a good choir in the organ-loft to sing the *Gloria* and *Sanctus*. Many Anglicans will doubtless object to such a suggestion; but it is the custom of Europe, and ought not to be despised. In attempting to reform our English Church, many absurdities have been perpetrated of late years. Thus, when it was discovered that stoles were articles of priestly attire, we were straightway deluged with them on every possible occasion,—so that we have seen two or three hundred clerics marching with pendant stoles to a church where there was only one altar, and no celebration to take place at the time! Even cathedral tradition, had it been respected, would have saved us many such exhibitions. Then, again, the *Morning Hymn*, which was used as a remnant of the processional, was frowned down because it was utterly opposed to the rationale of the Church service, which began with confession, not praise. Hymns, as opposed to Tate and Brady, for a long time met with deadly opposition, because they were not in the Prayer Book; but the metrical version of the Ten Commandments was quite allowable, because it had the good fortune to have received the sanction of the printer. Even when men did get beyond this piece of petty conventionality, they would hear of nothing but the ancient hymns, set to tunes which at the time none could understand, and very few sing. The consequence was, that though the Church

was well rid of its former abominations, and was on the fair road to improvement, yet the service of an out-and-out High Church Parson was as uninteresting and dead as it could well be; and no wonder that the worthy churchwarden who delighted in the rolling bass of Shirland, and used to help the clerk out in his spelling, bristled up at having to intone all day long on G, or at being allowed, by way of variety, to try his hand at "Hostis Herodes impie."

Gallery singers, no doubt, represent the clerks of the rood screen, (at Norwich the choristers still ascend to the rood on Sundays,) just as the parish clerk, who in the course of time has grown from boyhood to wheezing old age, reminds us of the office of a Server; but Anglicans, like true reformers, would hear of nothing that could plead tradition. Antiquity alone received favour at their hands; and as they had read that monks and clerics used formerly to chant in the choirs, they at once dragged their little charity-boys to the front, and launched out into full cathedral services. The change, luckily, was of great benefit, for it introduced congregational singing in the Divine offices. All we now plead is, that where congregational singing is thought inexpedient, the choir may be allowed to resume its old place in parish churches—the western gallery—the clerks of the chancel being reserved for the due performance of ritualistic functions, and as effective aids to the people in singing the Hymnal and Psalter of the minor offices.

We conclude by hoping that musical excellence will always be cultivated in England, and that music may be so applied to our services, that it will deepen the people's devotion for the Eucharist, and will induce them to take greater delight in the more homely offices of religion.

[Though the writer of this Paper sometimes travels over similar ground to that occupied by an able author in our last volume, and not unfrequently crosses his lines, we gladly give it a place, considering the value of some of its suggestions, and the notable fact that musical people and musical critics, like doctors, frequently differ both in stating principles and in remedying defects.—Ed. U. R.]

Art. III.—CARDINAL XIMENES. In Two Parts.

Part I.

On the 27th of April, 1857, the city of Alcalá de Henares, was gladdened by a remarkable ceremony. Nearly all the ministers of state, dukes, marquises, rectors of colleges and universities, military officers, clergy of every degree, and a vast concourse of the faithful, came to deposit the remains of Cardinal Ximenes in a crypt of the *Iglesia Magistral*, just 340 years after his decease. The standard carried before him at the siege of Oran floated on the air, and in the choir his breviary, pastoral-staff, and the keys of Oran were exposed to the view of the crowds assembled in the nave of the beautiful Gothic Church.* Few, if any, names are dearer to the Spaniards, than that of Ximenes de Cisneros. They talk indeed with pride and delight of Isabella in the camp, of Ferdinand's conquest of Granada, of the exploits of the Marquis of Cadiz, of Gonsalvo de Cordova, Columbus, Cervantes, St. Theresa, Calderon, Isla, and Feyjoo, but Ximenes alone among their countrymen was distinguished highly in various branches, and can be pointed to as a mortified prelate, a general, a statesman, and a man of letters. The impress of his genius on society was thus multiplied fourfold, and if the Church was loud in praise of his goodness, the world was no less so in extolling his greatness. Regard him which way you will, in the cloister, the camp, the cabinet, or the study, you will find him equally possessed of mental power and unbending resolution, equally fruitful in expedients, and bold in enterprise. Lord Chatham owned to Fox, that of all characters in history, Ximenes was his favourite.†

It was his lot from the first to battle with difficulties and endure hardness as a good soldier of the cross. Born in 1436, of a family decayed though ancient, he was compelled to give private lessons on civil and canonical law in order to complete his studies at the University of Salamanca. There he first showed that preference for biblical research, which afterwards made him so famous, and there by the advice of his father he resolved to seek his fortune in the living heart of Christendom. The very thought of Rome and the tombs of the Apostles filled him with enthusiasm, and though twice on his journey he fell among thieves, who plundered him and stripped him of his

* Don Roman Goicoerrotea. Madrid, 1857.

† Horace Walpole's *Memoirs of the Reign of George II.*, vol. iii. p. 19.

clothes, he pursued his way till he reached his destination. Six years were spent in study and pleading in ecclesiastical courts under the shadow of the Papal throne. It was an atmosphere as congenial to Ximenes as to most persons it would be distasteful; and when he was recalled to Spain by the death of his father, and he set his face towards Toledo, with a view of becoming the support of his poor relations, the Pope gave him an *expectative* letter, in virtue of which he was to occupy the first vacant benefice of a certain value in that diocese.* The Third Council of Lateran, and several Popes, had forbidden such promises, yet still they were made. The Archpriest of Uzeda died, and Ximenes claimed his living. "No," said the Archbishop, "I deny your right, and will resist your claim." Accordingly, Padre Ximenes was lodged as a prisoner in one of the strongest towers in his own parish, where the mailed and martial Archbishop Carillo tried in vain to break his inflexible will. In this confinement, a friend reminded him of another prisoner there, who had formerly been freed and raised to the archbishopric. Such he predicted would be the lot of Ximenes, and so it proved. He held it a point of conscience to cleave to the appointment to the benefice, since it involved what he conceived to be the rights of the holy see. From Uzeda he was removed to the fortress of Santorcaz, and after six years of imprisonment the Archbishop yielded to the requests of his niece, and restored the resolute captive to freedom and his benefice. It was soon exchanged for a chaplaincy in a pleasanter diocese, and at Sigüenza, Ximenes, now in his forty-fourth year, devoted himself assiduously to the study of Hebrew and Chaldee. His delight was in the law of the Lord and in that law he meditated day and night. He would willingly, he used to say, exchange all his legal knowledge for the explanation of a single passage of Scripture. His sense of its inspiration was like Dante's, who speaks of reading *in God* for reading in the Bible.†

Never was a mind cast more completely in the monastic mould than that of Ximenes. Made Grand-Vicar of the diocese of Sigüenza and agent of the estates of Count Silva de Cifuentes, whom the Moors had captured, he sighed for total release from worldly business, entered a convent of the Franciscan order at Toledo, and thence removed, at his own earnest request, to a lonely and distant monastery in the midst of a forest of chesnuts. There the hermit of Castanar, as we may fairly call him, made a grotto like an ancient anchorite, drank

* Barrett's *Life*. He follows chiefly Fléchier and Marsollier, who relied principally on a Latin translation of Gomez.

† Purgatorio, iii. 126, Avesse in Dio ben letta questa faccia.

water from the spring, and filled his scrip with fruits and herbs. There, clothed in a hair-shirt, he allowed himself no other indulgence but the glories of nature in her solitude, the manna of holy Scripture, and the interchange of psalm and prayer. There he chastised his body with the discipline, and enjoyed so keenly the communications of divine grace, that in after life, when he had reached the pinnacle of his grandeur, he used to look back with envy and regret on the days he had passed in the peaceful and angel-haunted chesnut shades of Castañar. But it was not long before he was transferred to Salzeda, and was there chosen by the religious to be their guardian. His late diocesan, however, bore him in mind, and lamented that parts so extraordinary as his should be buried in a convent. He recommended him to the Queen as her confessor, sent him a message to repair to Valladolid, where Isabella held her court, conducted him as if by chance into the royal apartment, and presented him in all his hermit-like simplicity to Ferdinand's most devout and beautiful consort.* But Ximenes was not abashed at the presence of royalty. His native dignity, candour, and unfeigned piety, made so strong an impression on Queen Isabella, that two days after she informed him of her wish that he should be her confessor. He modestly declined a post so much at variance with his mode of life, and, like a true monk, was obedient to the precept *Coram magnatis non libenter appareas.*† But the Queen's commands might not be resisted, and Ximenes was duly installed as her adviser, and the more he sought to avoid interference in political matters, the more constantly did Isabella seek his counsel.

Circumstances soon led to his appearing in the character of a reformer. Elected Provincial of the Franciscan Order for Old and New Castile, he travelled through his vast province on foot, begging his way, never mounting the mule his brother Franciscan led unless indisposed, and often subsisting on a few roots. The Order had fallen from its pristine zeal, and was divided into *Conventuals* who relaxed their rule, lived in stately edifices and indulged in prodigal expenses, and *Observantines* who strove to adhere to the letter and spirit of the precepts of their founder. To these last, Ximenes belonged, and, backed by royal authority, he obliged the monks who, like Jeshurun, "waxed fat and kicked," to amend their ways or vacate the sanctuaries they profaned.‡ A bull for the same

* Prescott's *Ferdinand and Isabella*, ii. 252, 254.
† *De Imitatione Christi*, i. 8.
‡ Von Hefele's *Life*, translated by Dalton, p. 31.

purpose was obtained from Alexander VI., and Ximenes welcomed the calumnies with which he was virulently assailed as a means of conformity to the image of Christ. Meanwhile his reputation increased. Peter Martyr spoke of him as resembling the anchorites St. Hilarion and St. Paul, and the public voice compared his wisdom to St. Augustine's, his austere life to St. Jerome's, and his zeal to that of St. Ambrose.

It happened one day, it was on Good Friday, 1495, that Ximenes, having heard the Queen's confession, was preparing to leave his convent at Madrid, and retire, as he was wont, to Ocaña for solitude and meditation. A chamberlain, however, summoned him unexpectedly to her Majesty's presence. After a long conversation on indifferent topics, the Queen placed in his hands a paper from his Holiness Alexander VI., which the friar kissed reverently and began to read. As he read the superscription he turned pale, for it ran—"To our venerable brother, Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros, Archbishop elect of Toledo." "This cannot be intended for me," he exclaimed, and then dropping the packet abruptly left the apartment. Arrived at his convent he said to his companion, Ruyz, "Come, brother, we must leave here as soon as possible." He was already three leagues from the city, pacing rapidly through the noontide heat on the way to Ocaña, when the royal messengers overtook him. They persuaded him to return, but no arguments could prevail on him to accept a post to which hundreds aspired without a hope of obtaining so exalted an eminence. He had hoped, he said, to pass the remainder of his days in peaceful fulfilment of his monastic duties. He had neither capacity nor inclination for public life, and it was too late to acquire a fitness for it. In these sentiments he persisted during six months, till a second bull from Rome commanded him to accept the proposed dignity. The Archbishop of Toledo at that period was Primate of Spain and Chancellor of Castile. His yearly revenue was 80,000 ducats;* he was the owner of towns and fortresses with numerous vassals. In power and influence he ranked next to the King, and the post had generally been held by a noble of highest degree. Ferdinand, indeed, had sought it for his natural son, Alfonso of Aragon, but this prelate's life was not exemplary, and having been an archbishop from his sixth year, he was still only twenty-four years of age.† In the case of Ximenes it was wisely judged that his unwillingness to accept the primacy only made him the fitter

* About 702,200 dollars. Prescott, ii. 76, note.
† Canon Dalton, p. 35, note.

for it, and posterity has never ceased to applaud Isabella's choice. Ximenes was now in his 60th year. His public career, like Hildebrand's, began where that of most men ends. All that went before was but a discipline—a long training for final conflicts. He was consecrated at Tarazona, October 11, 1495, and when he came to kiss the hands of their Majesties he declared that he did so not because they had raised him to the first see in Spain, but because he hoped they would assist him in supporting the burden which they laid on his shoulders. He now fairly commenced the life by which he is known to mankind. Greatness had come in contact with greatness. He was counsellor to a Queen who, by the union of her crown of Castile with that of Ferdinand, had founded a mighty kingdom, and by the energy and sweetness of her character commanded universal homage. Amid the splendour of his new position he retained the habits of the cloister. Like St. Charles Borromeo, he was a mortified hero of the Church. No silver adorned his table, no ornaments decorated his apartments. His garment was that of his order, his food of the coarsest kind. His journeys were performed on foot, his asses grew sleek in the stables, and his mule had seldom to complain of his weight. His palace was turned into a monastery, and he slept on a miserable pallet concealed beneath a more luxurious couch.* The more brilliant the scenes in which he moved, the more he recoiled from them inwardly, seeking peace in perfect abstraction from all but God. Even after he had been exhorted by the Pope to conform his habits to the dignity of his position, though he appeared in public with the customary pomp of an Archbishop of Toledo, he practised the same austerities in secret, and mended his own clothes to remind himself of his own insignificance. Fifteen wealthy cities, besides a large number of towns and villages, formed his princely domain, and he feared the seduction of riches more than all the trials attendant on want and beggary. In the distribution of offices, however, in his diocese, he would brook no interference nor listen to any pleas preferred on the grounds of position and influence.

It would be impossible in the space assigned me to give an account of the many wise regulations he put forth for the guidance of his clergy, or to repeat the numerous anecdotes respecting his archiepiscopal life which abound in the pages of his biographers, Gomez, Quintanilla, Oviedo, and Robles. I am anxious rather to dwell on the more salient points in his

* Gomez, fol. 12.

history, which bring into prominent relief the good and the questionable features of his character. The conversion of the Moors, the conquest of Oran, the foundation of the University of Alcalá, the Complutensian Polyglot, the extension of the Inquisition by Ximenes, and his policy as Regent, are subjects of so great importance and interest as to throw all minor particulars into the shade. One instance may be given of his talents as an administrator, because it ensured him popularity in his office of chancellor. The tax called Alcavala was extremely odious. It was a property tax which had grown out of the Moorish wars, and it required that a tithe of everything sold or exchanged should be paid to the Exchequer. It produced of course endless trickery on the part of functionaries, buyers, and sellers. Unable to procure its total abolition, Ximenes obtained this improvement. The whole revenue of the tax was fixed at a certain sum, and each town and village was obliged to collect and return its own quota. Both the State and the people gained by this alteration, and a thousand altercations and exactions ceased.*

The Moorish kingdom of Granada, hemmed in by Catholic populations, was gradually yielding to the influence of a diviner system. A treaty concluded with it by Ferdinand and Isabella secured to the subject Moors the free enjoyment of their ancient laws and religion. Tendilla, the governor of Granada, was benevolent and wise; Talavera, the Archbishop, was beloved and respected even by the Mussulmen, who styled him "the great Alfaqui of the Christians." He strove to bring them to Christ, but by means which Christ would approve. He learned at an advanced age the Arabic language, and caused parts of the Bible, the Missal, and Catechism to be translated into that tongue. He repudiated every species of compulsion, and relied on the spiritual weapons with which the armoury of the Gospel is stored. Success attended his efforts, but it was not rapid enough to suit the more trenchant spirit of Ximenes. He was invited by the sovereigns to Granada to aid in the mission, and he resorted to a system of allurements and menaces such as his zealous partisans applaud and his sober critics universally deplore. One of his first acts was to invite the Alfaquis, or Mussulmen doctors, to a conference, and to back his arguments in favour of Christianity with presents of silks and costly articles of dress, of which the Moors were especially fond. Such an appeal to

* Von Hefele, p. 54. Barrett, p. 64.

their "sensual minds"* was not likely to fail. The learned doctors one after another professed themselves convinced of the truth of the Catholic religion, and the more illiterate, following their example, accepted baptism by thousands, and encumbered the revenues of Ximenes' see for many years. It may well be guessed what manner of Christians they became who were converted by such means. It was a policy like that pursued at a later period by James II., who among the converts he made to Roman Catholicism numbered the superannuated Peterborough, the silly Salisbury, the licentious Whycherley, the infamous Haines, the gross and immoral Dryden, and those wretched agents of tyranny, the Earl of Perth and his brother Melfort.† In a matter that concerns the immortal soul to offer any worldly bait to persons only too likely to be influenced by venal motives, is a strange dereliction from the simplicity of Christian morals.

Conversions so numerous as 4000 in a day alarmed and incensed the Moors who clung to their fathers' creed. The spirit, if not the letter of the treaty,‡ was already violated in their opinion. They clamoured, and were arrested; they pined in prisons, and were compelled to listen to the exhortation of Catholic priests. Those who refused were punished severely; and a noble named Zegri, who was highly esteemed by his countrymen, declared under the pressure of fasting and fetters that Allah had revealed to him the truth of Christianity and bidden him to be baptized immediately. Warmed by sudden zeal for the conversion of his brethren, he recommended Ximenes to "let loose" among them one of his chaplains named *Leon*, and promised signal success as the reward of his efforts. His counsel was taken; the work was pressed forward with new energy, and the bounds of the treaty made with the Moors having clearly been exceeded, Ximenes proceeded still further in the use of terror. It is not from hostile but from friendly historians and biographers that we learn what instruments he employed. Mariana tells us how he forcibly received into the Church, against the wish of their parents, the Moorish children descended from renegades.§ The violent arrest of the daughter of one who had apostatised from Christianity caused a riot in the Moorish quarter of the city, and the officer of justice sent to take her was killed by a stone. The major-domo of Ximenes narrowly escaped the

* Von Hefele, translated by Dalton, p. 62.
† See Macaulay, *Hist.* ii. 346, iii. 32.
‡ Given at length in Marmol's *Rebelion de Moriscos.*
§ Lib. xxvi. cap. 5.

same fate, and the Moors in the Albayein rose in a body and rushed toward the palace of the Archbishop, invoking vengeance on the head of him who had destroyed their liberty and violated their covenanted rights. The synods of Toledo, no less than the articles signed by Ferdinand and Isabella, prohibited any one being forced to embrace the Catholic religion; and literature and science felt outraged, as well as Islamism, by the burning of many thousand Korans and Arabic works in the public squares by order of Ximenes. Medical writings only escaped the flames, and were afterwards placed in the University of Alcalá, of which he was the founder. It is true that he burned the rest with a view of weaning Moorish minds from Moorish misbelief; yet it may well be doubted whether such fierce measures do not always overshoot their mark. It is nothing to the purpose that Luther in like manner burnt the books of Canon Law before the gate of Wittemberg;* Ximenes should have set Luther a milder and better example. The excesses of the reformer do not (as Von Hefele seems to suppose)† palliate those of the prelate. The arrival of Tendilla, the governor, with an armed force from the Alhambra, alone saved him from the fury of the Moors, and after ten days of open rebellion the excited Moslems were appeased, not by the renewed exhortations of Ximenes, but by the appearance of the mild and venerable Archbishop Talavera in their midst. He, like Pope Leo before Attila, calmed the storm, and Tendilla helped him in the work of conciliation. The reproaches with which the sovereigns covered Ximenes are recorded by Gomez and Robles, but they add likewise that, having heard the Chancellor's defence, they thanked him for his services, and by his advice offered the rebels the cruel alternative of baptism or punishment for high treason. Nearly all the Moors of Granada embraced Christianity in consequence; but with Christ on their lips they had Mahomet in their heart, as Peter Martyr testifies. Many escaped to the mountains or crossed the sea to Barbary, but the multitude of those who remained in the Communion of the Church was supposed to justify a broken treaty and conversion by terror. The relapses of the converts as time went on afforded abundant scope to the labours of the Inquisition. But success is usually triumphant, and every tongue was loud in praise of Ximenes. The good Archbishop Talavera applauded his work, and the philosophic

* Audin's *Life of Luther*, i. 234, 235. † p. 66.

Martyr endorsed it with his approval. Gonsalvo de Cordova wrote expressing his satisfaction at it; Fléchier* warms at the recital as becomes a bishop of the time of Louis XIV.; Von Hefele and Canon Dalton record it with professed admiration, feebly qualified by hints at Ximenes' "violence" and "occasional want of prudence."† But no authority can in our day blind us to the fact that it transgressed the eternal principles of justice and right. It was the proceeding of a thoroughly medieval prelate—of one who rose high and nobly above the temptations of the world, but was incapable of rising above those of his age. It was exactly what we might expect from one who afterwards enforced the authority of the Inquisition to the utmost, and who opposed the enlightened scheme of Talavera for translating the Bible into Arabic for the use of the Moors. "The Scriptures in the vulgar tongue," he said, "would be pearls cast before swine. The Oracles of God should be confined to the three languages inscribed upon the Cross." The piety engendered by the cloister is not always without alloy, and the hand that holds the scourge of self-discipline is often the readiest to unsheathe the sword of persecution. The blessings of the Gospel inheritance are indeed above price, yet they can hardly be possessed by those who are bribed or menaced into accepting them.

When the Ephesians burned their books of magic at the preaching of S. Paul,‡ they did so spontaneously. But it was otherwise with the Arabic works tossed to the flames by Ximenes' order. Many of them were scientific treatises having no theological drift. They were in general beautifully executed and sumptuously bound; for the Spanish Arabs excelled all the people of Europe in manual arts. It is difficult to reconcile the discrepant account of historians with regard to their number; Robles states it at 1,005,000; Gomez and others at 5000; and Conde, who was better instructed than his predecessors in Arabic lore, at 80,000 volumes. We know that the library of the Ommeyades at Cordova had contained 600,000 books; and although the palmy days of Moorish learning were gone by, literature still flourished, and the treasures of the past were carefully preserved. O Gothic zeal, which for the sakê of so doubtful an advantage could destroy such precious monuments of human industry and genius! O strange perversity, which could incite the man at that very

* *Histoire de Ximenes*, p. 119.

† *Life of Ximenes* (Dolman, 1860), p. 66-71; *Notes and Queries*, March 2, 1867.

‡ Acts xix. 19.

moment spending his large revenues in the publication of the greatest literary work of the age, and the endowment of a learned university, to set fire to those stores of Arabian wisdom to which his country was already indebted for much of its progress! If Omar really burned the Alexandrian library, as Arab writers say, he certainly finds his counterpart in the devout, and (in this matter) misguided Ximenes. He did what the Popes happily have not done by the relics of classic lore—he defrauded the human mind of a portion of its inheritance, and Arabic scholarship, once so flourishing in the peninsula, thenceforward decayed for want of aliment to support it.

A severe illness brought Ximenes in his sixty-fourth year nigh to the gates of death. He was removed from the fortress of the Alhambra to the less exposed and royal summer house of Xeneralifa in the neighbourhood. Ferdinand and the Queen visited him frequently, and every art was tried for his recovery. A Moorish convert at last, who was married to the Archbishop's cook, offered to bring an old dame of her own nation to his bedside and restore him to health. Her nostrums were never known to fail; disease and pain fled before her ointments, herbs, and incantations. In a short time the venerable patient was breathing the pure air on the banks of the Darro. He was destined to survive many years the Sovereign so much younger than himself, who had raised him from a simple monk to the highest ecclesiastical dignity in Spain. She died in November, 1504, in her fifty-fourth year, and the Archbishop, though accustomed to repress his feelings, gave vent to his grief when he received from the King the news of her decease. "Never," he exclaimed, "will the world again behold a queen with such greatness of soul, such purity of heart, such ardent piety, and such zeal for justice."

Meanwhile he was building a grand and lasting monument to his own name. During the whole of his past life learning had flourished in Spain with extraordinary vigour. Grandees and noble ladies vied with each other in the pursuit of letters. Many of the latter held chairs in universities, and lectured publicly on rhetoric and the classics. Printing-presses were to be seen in all the principal towns by 1478; and many works had been published by the special order and at the cost of Ximenes and the Queen before the century closed. So popular had learning become by the year 1488 that Peter Martyr lectured on Juvenal before so large an audience that the entrance to the hall was completely blocked up, and the

lecturer was borne in on the shoulders of the students.* The ancient university of Salamanca, where he shone as a star of the first magnitude, had seven thousand students within its walls. The colleges of Toledo, Seville, Granada, Ognate, Ossuna, and Valencia were founded in rapid succession to supply the demand for knowledge, and Ximenes was no sooner raised to the see of Toledo than he conceived the lofty design of founding a seat of learning which should rival that of Salamanca in the splendour of its buildings and the efficiency of its professors. The town of Alcalá, which was the ancient Complutum,† seemed well suited for the purpose. The scenery there was charming, and the air balmy and healthful. It skirted the fair banks of the Henares, and was made for study and retirement. Ximenes' early studies there made the spot dear to him,‡ and he well knew that the beauties of natural scenery give a pensive and suitable character to a seat of learning. So it had been with Athens, and so also, though in a less degree, with the Universities of Louvain and Paris.§ Designs for the new building were furnished by Gumiel, the chief architect in Spain, and in the year 1500 the foundation-stone of the college of San Ildefonso was laid by the archbishop. Ferdinand and Isabella contributed largely towards the fund required, and Julius II. granted sundry privileges to the new foundation. However engrossed with the cares of Church and State, Ximenes never lost sight of his fondest scheme. The spirit of King Alfred and William of Wykeham was upon him, and the walls of Alcalá were to him as the bulwarks of Zion. Often might he be seen among the buildings, with the rule in his hand, taking measurements, and rewarding the more industrious workmen. The ten colleges and the hospital for invalids were all built in the most substantial manner, and many parts, such as the libraries, refectories, and chapels, were elegantly and even splendidly furnished. The town itself was improved and enlarged, that the setting might be somewhat in keeping with the gem. Even as regards the exterior it was a noble work, and it excited great admiration in the mind of Francis I. He visited the spot a few years after the Cardinal's decease, and said, "Ximenes has executed more than I should have conceived. He has done singly what in France it has cost a line of kings to complete."

* Epist. lvii.

† Von Hefele, p. 117. Peter Martyr says (Epist. 254) that such is *reported* to have been the case.

‡ See Christian Schools and Scholars, vol. ii. p. 359.

§ Newman's Office and Work of Universities, ch. iii.

The College of San Ildefonso stood at the head of the new university. Thirty-three professors were appointed to it, according to the number of years our Saviour lived, and twelve chaplains, whose number was also mystical. Oral instruction figured largely in the collegiate plan, and public disputations (in which our universities are so lamentably defective) formed an important part of the students' training. The salaries of professors were regulated by the number of their pupils, and every professor was re-eligible at the end of four years. The utmost stimulus, therefore, was applied to their exertions. The curriculum embraced the whole circle of sciences then known, and the forty-two chairs were thus distributed:—

Theology	6
Canon Law	6
Medicine	4
Anatomy	1
Surgery	1
Arts (logic, physics, and metaphysics)	8
Ethics	1
Mathematics	1
Ancient Languages	4
Rhetoric	4
Grammar	6

It was easy, therefore, for each student to choose those lectures which best suited his bias and vocation. Boarding schools in connection with the university were endowed by Ximenes for poor scholars, and diplomas were given to successful candidates. Bachelors, licentiates, and masters of arts at Alcalá went forth to fight the battle of life with a prestige of no small importance already attached to their names, and before many years passed it counted among its members many bishops, generals, and provincials of Orders, and other distinguished men. Philology especially flourished in the new Complutum.* All the monastic bodies in Spain, except the Benedictines and Jeronymites, established houses of their own in Alcalá, in order that their younger brethren might reap the advantages of a seminary so famous. The rector possessed judicial power over all persons belonging to the university, and the chancellor conferred degrees, and was present at the examinations, disputations, and scientific exercises. These gladiatorial displays were very frequent, and called forth all the activity of the student. Ximenes

* Erasmus, Epist. 755.

often attended them in person, and in the throes of the young athletes was pleased to mark their future success at the bar, in the pulpit, or in the cortez. Twenty years had not passed before the afflux of students to Alcalá was such that 7,000 of them went out to meet and welcome Francis I. on his arrival. When Ferdinand visited the place in 1514, his attendants desired the rector's beadles to lower their maces in the king's presence, but the sovereign rebuked their zeal, saying, "It is the seat of the Muses; the learned here are kings." During three centuries the light of knowledge was diffused over Spain in various degrees by the university of Alcalá, but the reduction of the country to a French province under Napoleon was fatal to it and many other academies. In 1807 the colleges were dissolved and suppressed, but their final extinction did not take place till 1850,* shortly before Cardinal Ximenes' remains were rescued from surrounding desolation.

Wonderful Ximenes! He mortifies and masters himself; he rises from an obscure priest to be the Queen's confessor; he whispers in her ear the decrees of state; he reforms his Order; he becomes primate with princely revenues; he converts a whole population of Moors by fair means or foul;† he founds a noble university; yet half his greatness remains yet untold. His diligence in promoting the study of the Scriptures in their ancient languages is worthy of all praise, and his Polyglot was accepted as a boon by the world of letters.‡ The influence of the Bible on literature is scarcely less than on faith and morals, and wherever it is neglected good taste in composition declines. It has a divine bearing on all things, more especially on the direct fruit of the mind. At the beginning of the 16th century the text of Scripture had become exceedingly corrupt, not from the carelessness or wilfulness, but through the ignorance of copyists. The newly-invented art of printing multiplied copies of the Vulgate so fast that eighty complete editions of it appeared between the years 1462 and 1500. Jewish Rabbis were busy editing the Hebrew Bible, and Protestant divines were putting forth new translations and deriving strange doctrines from vitiated copies of the Hebrew and Greek text. In short, as we read in *Hudibras*,

> "Religion spawn'd a various rout,
> Of petulant, capricious sects,
> *The maggots* of *corrupted texts.*"§

* *L'Univers*, 6 Juin, 1857.

† Prescott, *Hist. of Philip II.*, vol. iii. p. 5.

‡ Hallam, *Literary Hist. of Middle Ages*, i. 320, &c.

§ See Disraeli, *Curiosities of Literature*, iii. 427. Wiseman on Science and Religion, Lect. x.

The foundations of the faith were in danger through the uncertainty that hung around the Divine Oracles, and but for the traditions of the Church the creed of the Apostles would have been frittered away. The moment was highly favourable to Ximenes' twofold design—that of reviving "the dormant study * of the Sacred Scriptures" and rectifying the originals by the collation of the best MSS. to be found. No cost was spared, for the Complutensian Polyglot was to exhibit the Bible in the ancient languages, with vowel-points and accents, and to rival the *Hexapla* of Origen. The treasures of the Vatican were thrown open, and Leo X. ardently promoted the undertaking. All the public libraries of Europe were laid under contribution, and manuscripts which had been treasured up as heir-looms by harassed and wandering Israelites were purchased with large sums of money. Four thousand gold crowns were paid for seven such antiquities, which, after all, arrived too late to be of service. Nine scholars were charged with the conduct of the work. Ximenes frequently presided at their sittings, and it was not their fault if the result of their labours in six folio volumes looks, by the side of modern recensions, like a Spanish galley of the time of Charles V. confronted with a modern iron-clad. The editors did their best, but it is probable that they had not more than ten entire manuscripts to consult, and these were certainly not the best or the most ancient. Von Hefele is convinced (in opposition to Mill) that the *Codex Vaticanus* was not known at Alcalá,† nor indeed has it ever been ascertained what were the particular MSS. which Leo X., before his election or after,‡ sent for Ximenes' use. In our own day more than five hundred manuscripts, and among them those of the greatest antiquity, have been collated and classified through the labours of such men as Griesbach and Scholz.

It is not easy to determine how far Ximenes' opinions had weight in matters of criticism. His attainments in general literature are sometimes spoken of as limited, and Martyr, in one of his Epistles,§ certainly writes distrustfully on the point. On the other hand, he is said to have been an excellent biblical critic. The two accounts are not easy to reconcile, for high literary attainments are indispensable to the scholar who would translate or criticise the ancient Scriptures. Perhaps the best solution is to be found in the rare genius with which Ximenes

* Half-dead, *Studia intermortua*, Prolog. Polyglot.
† *Life of Ximenes*, p. 173, and note by Can. Dalton.
‡ See *Notes and Queries*, Jan. 28, 1865.
§ Epist. 160.

was endowed. This supplied in him many defects, and often led him to right conclusions even in studies in which he was by no means proficient. Three converted Jews, profoundly skilled in Oriental languages, Demetrius Ducas, of Crete, and the venerable Lebrija, were among his colleagues. "Make the most of your time, my friends," he used to say, "lest you should lose your patron or he should lose you. I value your services more than wealth or honour." The difficulties he had to overcome were greatly increased by the want of oriental types. He was obliged, indeed, to bring artists from Germany and have Hebrew types cast in the foundries at Alcalá under his immediate inspection. Fifteen years were occupied in completing the work; and the text being interlined with a Latin translation, and a Hebrew and Chaldee vocabulary being appended in the last volume, it became an invaluable instrument for acquiring languages previously little known. It was sold at a low price,* and 600 copies only being printed, it soon became extremely rare and valuable. It has fetched as much as £63, and would probably now be valued at a higher price. When the printer's son was sent in his best attire to present the first copy to the prelate, he solemnly blessed God, like Bede on a similar occasion,† and observed to the friends around him that no act of his administration was better entitled to their congratulation than the editing of the Complutensian Polyglot. In this opinion all will concur who prize the integrity of the Sacred Text. If it were now in the condition in which Ximenes found it, Colensos would multiply tenfold in every Christian land. All churches and all time are indebted to him; Cardinal Mai and Bagster alike have reason to hail him as their benefactor.

Besides the LXX and the Targum of Onkelos, which includes the Pentateuch only, the Archbishop caused the Chaldee paraphrases of the other books of the Old Testament to be translated into Latin and placed separately in the library of Alcalá. The charge brought against him by Webstein and Semler of accommodating the Greek text to the Vulgate cannot be substantiated, and Michaelis and Ernesti, not to speak of Griesbach, have defended him against his assailants.‡ The question, however, cannot now be settled in a satisfactory way, since the MSS. used for the Polyglot have been pitilessly destroyed. When Professor Moldenhauser visited Alcalá in 1784 in order to examine them, he learned that they had all

* 6½ ducats.

† Lingard's *Anglo-Saxon Church* vol. ii. p. 200.

‡ See Rosenmüller's *Handbook of Biblical Criticism*, iii. 289.

been sold to a rocket-maker of the town, and had gone the way of all fireworks. The edition of Aristotle which Ximenes projected was never brought to a conclusion. He entrusted it to Juan Vergara and other learned men, but its publication was deferred till after the appearance of the Polyglot, and the design was frustrated at last by the Cardinal's death. He printed, among other books for general use, a Life of St. Thomas of Canterbury, and carefully collected the best MSS. of the ancient Gothic or Mozarabic Liturgy, caused them to be revised, the Gothic letters to be changed into Castilian, and a large number of Mozarabic Missals and Breviaries to be thus printed. It is curious and interesting to compare this rite with the Roman and Oriental liturgies, in all of which the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the worship of Christ present in the great Sacrament, shines forth as the sun and centre of the Church's system.

At the time Ximenes was advanced to the see of Toledo society in Spain was plague-stricken. Bishops were wealthy and worldly, the natural sons of princes and grandees were adorned with mitres, cast off mistresses were made abbesses, ecclesiastics were too numerous, priests amply beneficed were unable to preach and ignorant of Latin, monasteries were made halls of luxury and riot, Judaism infected the priesthood, and the immoralities of Moors were closely imitated by Christians. Against this corruption Ximenes set his face like a flint. He temporised with no vice, and his stern virtue raised him up many foes. Among these the foremost was a Canon named Albornoz, whom the chapter of Toledo sent to Rome to counteract the Archbishop's righteous plans, and prejudice the Pope against him if possible. Ximenes, however, was more than a match for the wily Canon. He wrote immediately to the Spanish Ambassador in Rome, and caused Albornoz to be arrested at Ostia and conveyed back to Spain. He summoned the unruly Churchman before him at Alcalá and kept him closely confined in prison during nearly two years.* He was clearly not to be trifled with, and throughout his reforms, which were most salutary, he combined severity with gentleness, he amputated with one hand while he healed with the other. Another of his adversaries was the general of the Franciscan Order, who threw his shield over the Conventuals, or lax brethren, and traduced the archbishop to the Queen. But this man only excited Isabella's indignation, and was deposed by a general chapter held in Rome in 1506.

† Two-and-twenty months. Gomez, fol. 17.

The care which Ximenes showed for the welfare of his diocese and of the state, his conduct as grand inquisitor, his expedition against Oran, and his regency of Spain after the death of Ferdinand, are subjects too important to be passed over lightly, and must be reserved for a subsequent article.

Art. IV.—THE ORTHODOX DOCTRINE ON THE DEPARTED.

By a Member of the Holy Eastern Church.

That there is no more fruitful source of error in religion than the want of a due sense of our ignorance, is a conclusion warranted by the suggestions of reason and the experience of all ages. Men have at all times been prone to advocate doctrines which are supported neither by the evidences of natural religion, nor by the teaching of revelation; and which they could only become properly acquainted with through a full comprehension of the whole scheme of existence. Nothing but error can result from such presumption, and accordingly we find that no subject is more plentifully surrounded with superstition and falsehood than that of the state of souls after death. This remark is equally applicable to those who deny, as to those who admit, the truth of the Christian revelation; but it is my intention to treat here only of those unwarranted assertions, which are made by certain denominations of Christians, and to contrast them with the invariable teaching of the Orthodox Church on this mysterious and awful subject.

The tendency to unlimited speculation indulged in by the schoolmen of the middle ages resulted in a complete system of doctrine respecting the state of the departed. I cannot produce any authority which can better illustrate this fact than the "Summa Theologica" of Thomas Aquinas; this work is certainly to be regarded as the most able and complete exposition of the popular divinity of the time. In this "Summa" then, we find, as I shall show, an entire system of doctrine, on what is one of the most mysterious of subjects; and of course any man who should pretend to be able to prove the contrary of every proposition therein contained, would lay claim to at least an equal amount of information to that possessed by the author of it. For any one to be able to say, that there are not five receptacles prepared for the souls of the departed, he must have some definite data whereon to ground his opinion, and this is just what is wanting. Of course, if it can be distinctly proved that any of these propositions are directly contrary to any statement of Holy Scripture, that would be enough to condemn such propositions but such is the ingenuity with which the whole is devised and propounded, and so little is the information given

in Scripture, which for the most part maintains a profound silence on these subjects, that it is very difficult for this to be done. Accordingly, it would be very presumptuous in me, or in any man to profess to be able to argue the several questions in detail. What I would remark in general respecting them is—that they are simply not established by any conclusions of sound philosophy, or any statements of Holy Scripture; but consist for the most part of far-fetched inferences from certain metaphysical conclusions, as to the psychical and moral constitution of man; from a few passages of Scripture; and from the practice of the Jewish and primitive Christian Church. Other, and opposite inferences, might be arrived at with an equal amount of probability, and there is nothing to convince us that the hypotheses advanced in the "Summa," are the only ones consistent with all the acknowledged data. The reasonableness of this conclusion is very strongly confirmed by the fact, that modern Roman Catholic divines themselves have in great measure refrained from advocating the whole of this complicated system. They evidently feel, that they have enough to do, now-a-days, to support other and more important distinctive doctrines, and the only portion of it which is now insisted on, is that relating to the existence and reason of purgatory; but it will be seen that, like all the rest of this system, purgatory has its origin in the inventive ingenuity of the schoolmen. I shall now proceed to give a digest of that part of the "Summa" which treats of these subjects; namely, the 69th, 70th, and 71st Questions of the Supplement to the Third Part.

"Notwithstanding that souls have no place, in a manner known to us, yet, as we say that God is in heaven, so we say that the souls of those who are with God have a place there, and the souls of those who are banished from His presence have an opposite place."

From 2 Cor. v. and Philip. i. it is argued that the souls of the saints go immediately to heaven. From Luke xvi., that the wicked, in like manner, go direct to hell. It is concluded that "as bodies by their lightness, or gravity, either ascend or descend, unless there be an impediment, so also the souls of men, when freed from the prison of the body, either go direct to heaven (*nisi peccatum depurgandum obstiterit*) or to hell.

"Souls in paradise or hell cannot go thence *simpliciter*, so that it is their place no longer; but for a time they can depart, according to the order of Divine Providence," (*e. g.*, Moses, Elias, &c.)

From Genesis xlii., where Jacob speaks of bringing his grey hairs with grief to hell, it is argued, that the limbo of hell is the same as the bosom of Abraham. For—

"The souls of men cannot attain to rest, save by the merit of faith; because, for approach to God, it is necessary to believe. (Heb. xi.) But the first example of believing was afforded to man by Abraham; who first separated himself from the crowd of unbelievers, and received a special sign of faith; and, therefore, the rest which is given to men after death is called Abraham's bosom. But the souls of the saints after death have not had the same rest at all times; for, after the coming of Christ they have a perfect rest, enjoying the divine vision; but before the coming of Christ they had rest indeed by immunity from pain, but not that of desire, by the attainment of its end," (*i. e.* the beatific vision,) "consequently, the state of the saints before Christ's coming can be regarded either as to what of rest they did have, and in this light it is called Abraham's bosom; or, it can also be regarded as to that in which it was deficient in rest, and thus it is called the limbo of hell," (as, by hypothesis, it was by Jacob.) "Therefore, the limbo of hell and Abraham's bosom were, before Christ's coming, one by accident, and not *per se;* and hence nothing hinders that, after the coming of Christ, it should be Abraham's bosom, and be entirely different from hell; for things which are one by accident can become separated."

"This limbo, then, is not the same as the hell of the damned. For Christ is said, in the Apostles' Creed, to have descended into hell; but He only went to the limbo of the Fathers." "As far as the quality of the place is concerned, this limbo differs from the hell of the damned; but, as to situation, they are one continuous place; unless limbo may be supposed to be above hell."

As for the limbo of unbaptized infants, since Augustine, (Ench. c. 93) says that "*the punishment of these is most light, inasmuch as they are only debtors by original sin;*" and since nothing can be lighter than what the Fathers suffered, it is concluded that they have both the same place.

But mark well what follows:—"As to actual sin, there is due on account of it, a temporal punishment in purgatory, and an eternal one in hell; so also, to original sin, there is due a temporal punishment, in the limbo of the Fathers; and an eternal one in the limbo of infants. If, therefore, hell and purgatory are not the same, it appears that the limbo of the infants, and that of the Fathers, cannot be the same."

It is concluded that, "since there is no hope of the life of the blessed, to infants in limbo, which was not the case with the Fathers, so, by quality of reward and punishment, the limbo of infants differs from that of the Fathers; but it does not differ in situation, unless the latter be supposed to be in a higher situation."

"Five receptacles of spirits, separate from the body, corresponding to their different states, may properly be enumerated, namely: paradise, limbo of the Fathers, purgatory, hell, and the limbo of infants." This is the general conclusion, and it is thus very clearly illustrated: "Souls united to mortal bodies have a state of meriting," (*i.e.* are in a state suitable for the acquirement of merit); "but separate from the body, they are in a state of receiving good or evil, according to their merits. Thus, then, after death, they are either in a state for receiving their final retribution, or else in a state which impedes it. If they are in a state to receive final retribution, this may be twofold: either for good, and this is paradise; or bad, and this, if on account of actual fault, is hell, but if on account of original guilt, is limbo of infants. But if they be in a state which impedes final retribution following: this is either on account of personal defect, such is purgatory, in which are detained souls which cannot immediately receive their reward, on account of sins committed; or, it is on account of defect of nature: this is limbo of the Fathers, in which the Fathers were detained from fruition of glory, on account of the guilt of human nature not being yet expiated."

It will be observed that all this system is annihilated, if it be true, as the Orthodox Church maintains, that the separation of the soul from the body is a real impediment to final retribution; which is only attained after the general resurrection and the last Judgment: since it is only then that the restitution of all things will take place, according to the Scriptures. And this is thoroughly in accordance with reason; for since the soul and the body together constitute the man, and together have part in the state of probation, it can only be upon their being united, that a complete recompense can be experienced; and no other recompense can be final than that which is complete. Again, if the souls of the departed receive their final retribution whilst yet separated from the body, what will happen to them when the reunion takes place? Surely this must influence their condition, in some way, and, consequently, affect their state; so that, according to the scholastic hypothe-

sis, the final retribution is attained by souls before they attain their final condition!

It will be seen, that the only impediments recognised by the author of the "Summa," are, the limbo of the Fathers, and purgatory; and both of them depend upon the erroneous notion I have alluded to.

The next question treats of the condition of souls departed from the body, and the pain inflicted on them by corporeal fire.

S. Augustine (*lib. de Eccl. Dog.* c. 19) says, "Man consists of two substances only, soul and flesh; the soul with its reason, and the flesh with its senses." And Aristotle, speaking of the intellect: (lib. ii.), "It pertains to this alone to exist separate, as that which is permanent from that which is corruptible. But that the parts of the mind continue is manifest from this, that they are not separable."

Hence, the necessary conclusion is, that sensitive powers do not remain in separated souls, inasmuch as they depend upon the body. But here a distinction is attempted to be made; they are said not to "remain in separated souls *simpliciter*, but only *secundum originem*, in that manner, namely, in which *principiata sunt in principiis suis*."

Again, "since sensitive powers are altogether composite, their *act* does in no wise remain in souls separated from the body, unless indeed it be *tanquam in radice remota*." As may be supposed, this is supported by an extremely abstruse argument, into which it is useless to plunge; it is enough to say, that the force of these admissions, which evidently establish the impossibility of such a thing is so ignored, that the author arrives at this extraordinary conclusion: "Separated souls *can* suffer by a corporeal fire (!)

"For, since the same arguments apply to separated souls and to demons, as to their capability of suffering by a corporeal fire: and since demons suffer from such fire, when they are punished in the same pit as that into which the bodies of the damned are cast, after the resurrection; which necessarily must be corporeal, as is clear from Matth. xxv., *Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels;* from all this it follows that separated souls must suffer from a corporeal fire."

It would be difficult to find a more complete example of a sophistical argument. It proceeds from the *bodies of men, after* the resurrection, to *demons, before* the resurrection: and then back again from *demons* to the *souls of men—i. e.*, it infers that whatever pertains to the *bodies* of men, *after* the resurrection, pertains also to the *substance of demons before*

it; also, that whatever pertains to the substance of demons, pertains also to *separated souls*. Neither step is proved, for that which is said corporeally of men, is said spiritually of demons. And it must not be argued that whatever is true of *either, after* the resurrection, is true of *both, before* it. For the Apocalypse teaches us that a *great preparation* will be made before the final restitution of all things. The author proceeds:—

"Besides, punishment should correspond to the fault: but the soul, by its fault, subjected the body to itself by a depraved desire; therefore it is just that, as a punishment, it should be subjected by suffering to something corporeal."

This will properly apply to the eternal punishment of the soul, when re-united to the body; and not at all to the soul in its state of separation.

"Besides, the union of form to matter is greater than that of agent to patient; but the diversity of the spiritual and corporeal natures does not hinder the soul from being the form of the body; therefore, neither can it hinder that it may suffer by a body."

The answer to this is afforded by a conclusion of Aquinas himself, that "the soul is united to the body per contactum *virtutis*." (*Contra Gent.* lib. ii.)

We now come to the next question, which treats of suffrages for the dead, and this is handled with great ingenuity, but with equal presumption.

"All the faithful, united by charity, are members of the one body of the Church: each member is assisted by the others: therefore one man can be assisted by the merits of another.

"Although, for the attainment of reward, each one must be prepared by his own acts, and not by those of others; and thus the work of one cannot properly profit another, by way of merit, for the attainment of eternal happiness; still it can do so by way of prayer.

"Our acts have a twofold value—first, for the acquirement of any state, as by meritorious works man acquires the state of beatitude; secondly, for something accessory to state, as man by any act may acquire an accidental reward, or remission of punishment. Our acts can avail us in both these ways, in a twofold manner: one by way of merit; the other by way of prayer; and there is this difference between these two ways; that the one appeals to justice, the other to mercy. For he who prays, seeks his petition solely from the liberality of whomsoever he prays to. Accordingly, the work

of one man can never avail another in the acquisition of state, and by way of merit; (so as that by what I might do, another could merit eternal life) because the reward of glory is awarded according to the measure of the receiver. For every one is disposed of according to his own acts, and not according to the acts of others. By way of prayer, and as far as regards those things which constitute actual state, they can avail only the living. Thus the first grace may be given to one man, at the prayers of another: since this is given according to the liberality of God. As for that which follows after, or is accessory to, actual state, the work of one may profit another, not only by way of prayer, but also by way of merit: which, indeed, takes place in a twofold manner: either by communication *in radice operis*, which is charity in meritorious works: *and hence all who are connected together by charity, experience some benefit from their mutual works;* still, consistent with the measure of the state of each; and hence is that which becomes an article of faith, *the Communion of Saints.* The other way is by intention of the doer, who does certain works specially that certain persons may profit by them. Whence these works are, as it were, done by those for whom they are done, as conferred upon them by the doer; whence they are able to avail them for fulfilment of satisfaction, or anything of that kind which does not alter their state.

"Since charity never faileth, the works of the living profit the dead for diminution of punishment, but not for change of condition.

"The suffrages of sinners always are of profit, *ex opere operato;* but *ex opere operantis,* they do not profit as being made by a sinner, but only in so far as he personates the Church, or acts as the instrument of another.

"The work of suffrages, made for the dead, profits the performers thereof, as far as the acquirement of merit for eternal life is concerned; but by no means as expiative of punishment, so as to make satisfaction.

"Suffrages do not avail the damned.

"The suffrages of the living are an aid to those who are detained in purgatory, since the work of one person can avail another for satisfaction.

"For the punishment of purgatory is in supplement of satisfaction, which has not been consummated in the body, and therefore, since the work of one can avail another for

satisfaction, whether he be alive or dead, there is no doubt that the suffrages made by the living profit those who are in purgatory."

We are now in a condition to form a pretty full and connected notion of the scholastic system of the state of the departed, and the efficacy of prayers and suffrages in their behalf; but, as the object of this paper is a practical one, and chiefly concerns the efficacy of these prayers, I shall only call attention to one brief passage in the foregoing extracts, which throws a strong light upon the Orthodox doctrine,—it is that which refers to *the Communion of Saints*. The practice of prayers for the dead, as prevailing in the Christian Church of all ages, is the necessary consequence of this doctrine, and it could not be stated in better terms than those I have distinguished by Italics: "all who are connected together by charity experience some benefit from their mutual works." The converse proposition is established by the words of Scripture: *If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it.* This alone is sufficient to prove the truth of the principle. But this by the way; I shall have another opportunity of recurring to this branch of the subject; and, to return to the "Summa," it will be seen that, since the reason of purgatory is the deficiency of satisfaction, we require to know something of the scholastic doctrine upon satisfaction. I can only pretend to give a digest from the "Summa" here.

1. "Satisfaction is never to be imposed upon the newly baptized, because they are wholly freed by the passion of Christ; and satisfaction made by them would imply an injury to Christ's passion, as though it were not a sufficient satisfaction for the sins of the baptized.

2. "By satisfaction, the penitent acquires the full effect of grace; because he is wholly liberated from the guilt of sin.

3. "The Passion of Christ caused our salvation by way of satisfaction.

4. "This satisfaction was super-abundant.

5. "To satisfy, is to give due honour to God.

6. "Satisfaction is a work of justice, *i. e.* a judicial act.

7. "Whether it regards past or future sins, satisfaction is accomplished by penal works.

8. "Whether performed for one's self, or another, satisfaction is called a price.

9. "One man can satisfy for another, provided they be one in charity.

10. "Satisfaction implies the payment of a debt.

11. "The works of satisfaction are almsgiving, fasting and prayer.

12. "Penance removes all the fault of sin, but not always the whole guilt; that is, the whole debt of punishment."

So that satisfaction is that part of the debt of punishment, or of guilt, which penance is sometimes unable to remove. Upon this doctrine those of indulgences and of purgatory depend; and it affects the whole teaching of the Roman Church as to the use of penitential works. And this is the very root of her system: it is that part of the teaching of the schoolmen, which has held its ground, and which forms part of the essential teaching of the modern Roman Church; for both the doctrines of purgatory, and of indulgences, are certainly *de fide*, and form part of the Creed of Pius IV. Perrone thus clearly lays down the modern Roman doctrine of satisfaction: "satisfaction is a compensation for the injury offered to God by our sins. In every grave sin, two properties are found, namely, the fault and liability to eternal punishment, (when they are removed, man immediately returns to the grace of God,) and the liability to temporal punishment, which often remains after forgiveness of the fault; and for the expiation of which men ought to offer God alms, prayers, and fastings, and other pious works or pains, either voluntarily undertaken, or patiently borne, or enjoined by the priest; so that they compensate God for the injury done Him by their sins, and satisfy His justice." (Tract de Pœnit. cap. iv.)

Thus it appears that earthly penances and purgatory constitute part payment of the debt due to sin; indulgences are a remission of this part of the debt. The Roman doctrine holds that the penances prescribed by the Church are not only of use as moral discipline, respecting the future only, as tending to the eradication of sinful habit; but, that they are also satisfactory, or expiatory, to Divine justice on account of sins that are past. But how is this to be reconciled with the fact, which they dare not deny, that *the Blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin?* and that the satisfaction, thereby afforded to Divine justice, is superabundant and complete? It is attempted to draw a distinction between the sufficiency and the efficacy of the satisfaction afforded by His Blood; but the application of these qualifications to such terms as satisfaction or expiation is manifestly absurd: if a satisfaction or an expiation is *sufficient*, it is, by the very nature of the thing, *effectual*, provided only that it be appropriated at all. For it is simply a case of equivalence, and equivalence is not susceptible of degrees: if a thing be not equal to another it is

unequal to it; an amount sufficient for the payment of any debt is an effectual amount, and anything short of an effectual amount could not be sufficient. For the act of tender is presupposed. So with the Passion of Christ: it is freely offered, and can only be available when it is appropriated; in that case it provides us with a sufficient, and therefore necessarily an effectual expiation: and if, when once appropriated, it be not effectual, it must be because it is insufficient. It must be observed that this question in no wise relates to the application or appropriation of the merits of Christ, or of the operation of grace: these things are conditional, and, inasmuch as they involve a work of time, must, in some way, be susceptible of degrees. This appropriation, however, as I have said, is presupposed, and the whole matter relates to those who have made that appropriation, and who are actually in a state of grace. And what I affirm respecting such persons is, that so long as they continue in that state, *the Blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth them from all sin;* that their sins are completely expiated, by a superabundant satisfaction; and that all they have to do is to *make their calling and election sure*—that is, to take heed lest they fall away from that state of grace. And here comes in the orthodox doctrine of penances—namely, that they are intended for a moral discipline, and have no further influence upon sins that are past, excepting as they affect our present and future actions by way of habit. This habit is to be removed by the establishment of its contrary; and hence the penance has to be regulated by the nature of the habit. For sins of sensuality, it is useless to prescribe almsgiving; for bodily mortification is the proper exercise to counteract their effect upon the mind. Against sins of avarice, on the other hand, bodily exercise is of no avail; but liberality and almsgiving are to be practised; and so on. As for the remission of penance, or indulgences, it is manifest that until the sinful habit be subdued, it would be a want of charity to grant them; but as soon as that result is attained, the penance has served its purpose, and requires no authority to remit it. Hence indiscriminate indulgences, granted without a proper examination into the circumstances of the case or the state of the individual, are utterly inconsistent with the proper use of penance.

This view of the nature of penance entirely cuts away the ground from the position that purgatory is a provision for the payment of that debt, which the Passion of Christ has left unpaid; but there is another argument equally conclusive: "What has the forgiveness of sins to do with punishment by

fire and tortures? Only one of these two things can happen, either punishment or forgiveness, and not both at once." "In whatever manner you understand the fire of purgatory," says Bishop Macarius, in his Orthodox Dogmatic Theology, "whether literally or figuratively, in either case such effects cannot be attributed to it. If you adhere to the letter, you find that by its nature, fire is incapable of purifying from spiritual stains, the soul, which is a simple, immaterial substance. If you have recourse to the figurative sense, that is to say, if you see in this fire the interior torments of a soul haunted by the consciousness of its past sins, and the attrition of heart which they cause; nothing of that kind can purify the soul in the life beyond the tomb; for, in that life there is no place for man either to repent, to merit, or the contrary, nor to amend himself, as the Roman Catholics suppose; and, in case he remains in sin, unpurified and unregenerated, until then, whatever he may then endure, he can in no wise, by his own sufferings, satisfy the divine justice, or efface the inevitable consequences of sin."* Again, "the Orthodox Church decidedly rejects the fire of purgatory, a fire in the proper sense of the word, which can purify souls."† So the Orthodox Confession: after quoting Theophylact, who, "treating on these words of Christ, in the sixth chapter of Luke: *To whom power is given of forgiving sins on earth*, teacheth, saying, 'Observe, it is said *on earth*, for so long as we continue on earth, we can wipe out our sins, but after we leave this earth, we are no more able of ourselves to cancel our sins by our confessions. The doors are then shut.' And again, on the words of Matthew, (chap. xxii. 13.) *Bind him hand and foot.* By which the active faculties of the soul are meant, he says, 'In this life we may labour and endeavour, but afterwards, the active faculties of the soul are bound, nor can we any more do aught in atonement for our offences.' And further, on the xxv. chapter of the same Gospel, he says, 'There is no more time for repentance and good works after this life.' From all which, it is clear, that after its separation, the soul can no more perform penance, nor do any other work whereby it might be freed from the chains of hades."‡

Again, "It is nowhere taught in the holy Scriptures, that there is any temporary punishment, whereby the soul after death may be purged. On the contrary, the Church in the second Council of Constantinople, did condemn Origen for

* *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*, vol. ii. pp. 728, 730.
† See Ibid., p. 730.
‡ *Orthodox Confession.* Lodvill's Trans. Part I. Question lxiv. p. 65.

this very opinion. Moreover, it is evident that the soul, when once departed, cannot again become a partaker of the Sacraments of the Church. Could this be, that the soul could satisfy there for sins committed in this life, then by like reason it might partake of the Sacrament of penance there; which, being contrary to orthodox doctrine, the Church rightly and wisely offers the unbloody Sacrifice for those souls, together with her prayers, that they may be forgiven those things wherein they had offended whilst they continued in this life, and not that they might be delivered from any punishment that they were then suffering for a time only. Our Church doth not admit nor approve of such fables as some men have fancied, concerning the state of souls after death; as that they are tormented in pits and waters, and with sharp prongs, when they are snatched away by death, before they can have done sufficient penance for their faults."*

There is one passage of Scripture, however, which is very confidently relied on by the advocates of purgatory; it is the words of the Apostle Paul, (1 Cor. iii. 11-15.) *For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.* But these words, in reality, do no more than signify the immortality of the soul, even under the eternal fire of hell. For mark the time when this fiery trial takes place, it is *the day*, the day, that is, of the last judgment, which shall declare it; whence S. Paul prays for Epaphroditus, *The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord* IN THAT DAY. Then it is to be observed, that there are only two classes of works mentioned, *gold, silver, precious stones*, all of which abide fire, and suffer no loss whatever therefrom; and *wood, hay, stubble*, and these are all entirely consumed by fire: there is no middle class which intervenes between the two. By the three former then, the Apostle signifies virtues; charity, purity, martyrdom, virginity, and the like; by the three latter, that which is contrary to these, namely, bad works. So that although the evil deed will be destroyed by fire, and the evil doers will *suffer loss*,

* Ibid., Part I. Q. lxvi. p. 67.

that is, will be for ever banished from the presence of the only good; yet they will not be destroyed, but will continue their existence in the fire, and suffer eternally: this is the purport of the word σωθήσεται, and not that of salvation in bliss. This is the sense given to the passage by S. John Chrysostom, and it is evidently in complete accordance with the whole bearing of the passage.

Rejecting, then, the complicated system invented by the schoolmen, and in particular the figment of purgatory, as devoid of all foundation in the written and traditional teaching of the Church; are we to adopt the opposite extreme, maintained by the Protestants, and dogmatically assert, equally without foundation, that prayers for the departed are offensive to God, useless to them, and superstitious in us? Surely, we could only be justified in so doing, were we properly acquainted with the precise condition of the souls of the departed, between the time of their decease and the last judgment, and final restitution of all things. As I have already said, we are extremely ignorant on all such points; is it for us, then, to "limit the Omnipotent in the exercise of His mercy?" May God preserve us from such extreme presumption! Let us, therefore, in a spirit of docility and reverence, listen to the teaching of the Holy Orthodox Church on these mysterious questions.

The "Longer Catechism," one of the most judicious expositions of doctrine, approved by her, teaches us as follows:—

"Till the general resurrection, the souls of the righteous are in light and rest, with a foretaste of eternal happiness; but the souls of the wicked are in a state the reverse of this. We may not, however, ascribe to the souls of the righteous, perfect happiness after death; because it is ordained that the perfect retribution according to works shall be received by the perfect man, after the resurrection of the body and God's last judgment.

"The Apostle Paul says, *Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing.* (2 Tim. iv. 8.) And again, *We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.* (2 Cor. v. 10.)

"We ascribe to the souls of the righteous a foretaste of bliss before the last judgment, on the testimony of Jesus

Christ Himself, who says, in the parable, that the righteous Lazarus was, immediately after death, carried into Abraham's bosom. This foretaste of bliss is joined with a sight of Christ's own countenance, more especially with the saints, as we are given to understand by the Apostle Paul, who had a *desire to depart and to be with Christ.* (Philip. i. 23.)

"With respect to such souls as have departed with faith, but without having had time to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance, this is to be remarked: that they may be aided towards the attainment of a blessed resurrection, by prayers offered in their behalf, especially such as are offered in union with the oblation of the bloodless Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and by works of mercy done in faith for their memory. This doctrine is grounded on the constant tradition of the Catholic Church; the sources of which may be seen even in the Church of the Old Testament. Judas Maccabæus offered sacrifice for his men that had fallen. (2 Macc. xii. 43.) Prayer for the departed has ever formed a fixed part of the Divine Liturgy, from the first Liturgy of the Apostle James. S. Cyril of Jerusalem says, "Very great will be the benefit to those souls, for which prayer is offered at the moment when the great and tremendous Sacrifice is lying in view."*

"S. Basil the Great in his Prayers for Pentecost says, that the Lord vouchsafes to receive from us propitiatory prayers and sacrifices 'for those that are kept in hades,' and allows us the hope of obtaining for them 'peace, relief, and freedom.'"†

It will be seen, from this extract, that the orthodox practice of prayers for the departed is not grounded upon any information we may suppose ourselves to possess as to their actual state; but rather upon the immemorial example of the Church of all ages. The only information we have on that subject is comprehended in the following hymn, which is the composition of S. John Damascene:

"In the tomb bodily,
And in Hades with thy soul as God,
And in Paradise with the thief,
And on the throne wert Thou, O Christ,
With the Father and the Spirit,
Filling all things, the Incircumscript."‡

* *Lect. Myst.* v. 9.
† *Longer Catechism.* Blackmore's translation, p. 98.
‡ *Octœchus*, Tone IV. *Can. Anast.* Ode i. verse 3.

That our Lord's Body was in the tomb, was proved by the stone sealed by the Jews: that He was in hades, is proved by the Scripture, *Thou wilt not leave My soul in hades*, which David says in the person of Christ, as proved by S. Peter (Acts ii. 27); He was in paradise with the thief, in accordance with His promise *To-day shalt thou be with Me in paradise;* that this paradise was not the same with heaven, is proved by His words which He spoke to Mary, *afterwards—I am not yet ascended to My Father* (John xx. 17). He was ever on the throne, in consequence of His consubstantiality with the Father and the Spirit, who are therefore here mentioned: and the reason why He could do all this, is His attribute of incircumscription. There is nothing here but what is clearly in accordance with the plain teaching of Scripture, and it would argue the greatest temerity in any one who should call it in question, but all that is here said, as well as the words of our Saviour, *In My Father's house are many mansions*, although they certainly encourage us in praying for the departed, do at the same time forcibly remind us of our ignorance as to their condition, and deter us from prying, with an unhallowed curiosity, into things which are not revealed.

It is the doctrine of "the Communion of Saints," however, which is the true foundation of the practice, this glorious verity, to deny which would be to deny the Holy Ghost Himself, who, by His Divine efficacy, unites all the faithful into one communion and fellowship, just as the members of each man's body are united by the possession of a common vitality; I say, it is this grand truth which encourages us to persevere in an exercise so consolatory, so charitable, and so beneficial. For what can be more calculated to confirm our faith in the great truths of religion, in a future life, and in the boundless power and goodness of God, than the reflection that death is, after all, a mere material change; that it neither affects the integrity of the soul itself, nor of those bonds of charity and affection which unite us to it; and that our belief in the unity of the whole of Christ's mystical Body is not a barren sentiment, but a salutary principle fraught with advantage to all its members?

I cannot, however, offer a more convincing argument, in favour of the lawfulness and utility of prayers for the dead, than that afforded by the following passage, from one of the sermons of the late holy Metropolitan of Moscow:—

"There are some Christians who deprive themselves of the

consolation of prayers for the dead. And who are they? Without doubt those who, knowingly, or in ignorance, love to argue, rather than to believe. Why do they not admit prayers for the dead? It appears to have no other cause than that they do not understand how the efficacy of prayer can extend so far—from one world to another—from the visible to the invisible.

"I would ask a man who reasons thus, whether ordinary reason comprehends the efficacy of prayer, made by one living person for another—particularly if it be made for an absent person, or even for some one present—on behalf of any moral or spiritual benefit; such as pardon of sins, amendment of certain faults, subduing of the passions, illumination of the mind, confirmation in virtue? Are not two souls, each taken with its own proper reason, its will, its inclinations, its liberty, two distinct worlds to one another, and all the more distinct, that they are both limited by their bodies? How then can the prayer of one extend its efficacy to the other?

"Let any man answer these questions as he will. If he undertake to demonstrate, that the distinction of being and of liberty does not impede the efficacy of prayer for the living; by doing so, he demonstrates, at the same time, the efficacy of prayer for the dead. If he would say, that the efficacy of prayer for the living is possible, although it may not be explicable by the reason, I say in my turn, Do not then deny the efficacy of prayer for the dead, merely because it also is inexplicable, or appears to be so.

"But, in my opinion, the safest course is to argue less, and to believe more; and to rely, not on our own wisdom, but on the Word of God. But the Word of God tells us—*We know not what we should pray for as we ought.* Rom. viii. 26. Consequently, reason, without grace, cannot teach us whether we ought to pray for any one. *But the Spirit itself,* continues the Apostle, *maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered,* in the prayer of each one according to his situation; and the same Spirit, for a common guidance in prayer, especially that made in public, expresses clearly what we ought to ask. For example—*I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men.* 1 Tim. ii. 1. And again—*If any man see his brother sin a sin, not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death, I do not say that he shall pray for it.* 1 John v. 16. And again—*Pray for one another, that*

ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much. Jas. v. 16. Again: see how the Apostle S. Paul both prays for others, and asks their prayers—*We pray always for you,* he writes to the Thessalonians, *that our God would count you worthy of this calling, and fulfil all the good pleasure of His goodness, and the work of faith and power, that the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified in you and ye in Him according to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ.* 2 Thess. i. 11, 12. And further on, in the same Epistle: *Finally, brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may have free course, and be glorified even as it is with you.* iii. 1. And in another Epistle, *Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints, and for me, that utterance may be given unto me that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the Gospel, for which I am an ambassador in bonds.* Eph. vi. 18, 19.

"Without bringing together the numerous testimonies of Holy Scripture upon prayer in general, as being a thing well known, we will apply to the particular object of these reflections those which we have here quoted.

"If we know not what we should ask, and, to supply our ignorance, possess that Holy Scripture, *which is able to make us wise unto salvation,* to such a degree, *that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works,* 2 Tim. iii. 15, 17, we can rely upon the wisdom and goodness of the Holy Ghost, who has dictated that Scripture, not only for instructing us, in a satisfactory manner, as to what we should ask; but also for preserving us, by His prohibitions, from addressing to God prayers which would be displeasing to Him. This reliance is justified by the facts themselves. We can see, in fact, how Holy Scripture, at the same time that it inculcates prayer for all men, restrains the believer from prayer displeasing to God, and useless to men, by forbidding it. *There is a sin unto death, I do not say that he shall pray for it.* It follows from this, that, even if there be not in Holy Scripture any particular, positive, command of prayers for the dead, but it is deduced from more general principles and commands upon prayer; since, on the other hand there is no prohibition which forbids such prayer, as in fact there is not—this absence of prohibition itself, this very silence of Holy Scripture alone, is a proof that prayer for the dead is neither displeasing to God nor useless to men.

"A lover of doubt might demand: Is it not superfluous to pray for those who are departed in faith and hope? I rejoin: Is it not superfluous, in appearance, to pray for the saints? And yet S. Paul would have us pray *for all the saints.* Is it not superfluous to pray for the Apostles, who were propagators of grace to all others, and the first among the saints of the Church—God has set in His Church, *firstly Apostles!* 1 Cor. xii. 28. And yet, the Apostle Paul asks even those who are not Apostles, to pray for him, and what is more, he did so at the very time when he already approached the crown promised to the exploits of his Apostleship. If prayer is useful to the Gospel itself, *that the Word of God may have free course, and be glorified,* although the Gospel is itself *the power of God for salvation unto every one that believeth,* Rom. i. 16, is it reasonable—is it possible—to fear that prayer for the faithful departed is superfluous?

"But again, it may be asked, Is not prayer for those who are dead in sin, vain? I answer: it is vain for those who are dead in spiritual death by mortal sin, and who have been struck with corporeal death in that state—for those who have inwardly fallen away from the spiritual body of the Church of Christ, and from the life of faith, by their unbelief, their impenitence, their decided and final opposition to the grace of God. Whenever the signs of this sad death are clear to an enlightened and impartial view, there is no place for the consolation of prayer: *There is a sin unto death, I do not say that he shall pray for it.* But what can prayer do for him who hath committed a sin, yet one *not unto death?* It can *give him life!* But does this apply to him also who is bodily dead? S. John, in the words on which we are now engaged, does not say, *Yes.* But neither does he say, *No.* He does not forbid prayers for the dead, although he does forbid prayer for the impenitent and desperate sinner.

"The all-provident wisdom of God does not openly proclaim the command of prayer for the dead in Divine Scripture, perhaps on this account; that the living should not, by relying upon such aid, relax their efforts to *work out their own salvation with fear and trembling* before their bodily death. . . . And this, perhaps, is the reason why prayers for the dead have existed from antiquity, and still exist in the Church; not as an institution solemnly proclaimed, and essential to the faith, or as strictly prescribed; but as a tradition, and a pious custom, always upheld by the free obedience of faith, and by

frequent spiritual experiences. Let us appeal to some testimonies in its support.

"*Liberality*, writes the Son of Sirach, *hath grace in the sight of every man living; and from the dead withhold it not.* Ecclus. vii. 33. What is here meant by *liberality?* If it be the gift brought to the altar, the words *from the dead withhold it not* evidently signify, bring an offering for the dead, or, what is the same thing, pray for the dead. If it be supposed more probable that *liberality* signifies benevolence towards the poor, whether the one or the other of these thoughts were that of the Son of Sirach, they both suppose the same foundation, which is common to them—which is, that the living can and ought to perform good works, which may be useful to the souls of the dead.

"In the History of the Maccabees we find sacrifice and prayer for the dead actually mentioned. Judas offered it for those soldiers who died in the sin of having taken, as spoil of war, *the things consecrated to idols*, with which the just ought not to soil their hands. 2 Macc. xii. 39, 46.

"Ever since Christian worship has been publicly instituted, prayer for the dead has always been admitted in it, as forming an integral part thereof. All the ancient rituals of the sacred Liturgy prove this, commencing with that of S. James, the Brother of the Lord. Hence there can be no doubt, that prayer for the dead was an apostolic tradition.*

"'Even if a sinner be dead,' says S. Chrysostom, 'it is fitting to aid him as much as possible: and that, not by tears, but by prayers, supplications, alms and offerings. In fact, it is not by a foolish fancy, or in vain, that we make memory of the dead in the divine mysteries; and that we approach the immolated Lamb, who hath taken away the sins of the world, to pray for them; but that it may obtain some refreshment for them. Neither is it in vain that, before the altar, during the celebration of the tremendous mysteries, the priest prays for those who are dead in Jesus Christ, and for those who intercede for them.' *On* 1 *Cor. Homil.* 41. And further on he says, 'Let us not hesitate to help those who are dead, and to offer our prayers for them; for the entire world has need of being purified. That is why we pray with hope for all men in the world, when we name them with the martyrs, the confessors, and the priests. For we are all one body, of which

* See Dr. Neale's translation of the "Primitive Liturgies," the Appendix to which contains the prayers for the departed from many of them.

they are the more honourable members. And it is possible to obtain their pardon in all ways, as by prayers, by the offerings made for them, by the saints with whom we name them.' "*

It would be superfluous to insert, in this place, all the numerous passages from the Fathers, which speak in commendation of prayers for the dead. I shall only cite one from Tertullian: "We make prayers for the dead, each year, on the day of their decease." *De Coron. Milit.*, c. iii., and one from S. John Damascene: "It was not without reason, without use, or without advantage, that the friends and eye-witnesses of the Word, the disciples and apostles inspired by the Saviour, who have subjected the world, have instituted the practice of the commemoration of the faithful departed, at the order of the awful Sacrament; an institution which the Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ and God, reigning from one end of the world to the other, has kept firmly and without dispute from that time to this day, and will keep until the end of the world; for the Christian religion, being exempt from error, has never received anything useless, nor will she keep such things for all ages; but all that she contains is useful, agreeable to God, and infinitely salutary." (*De iis qui in fide dormierunt.*) The same Father has preserved passages from SS. Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Chrysostom; and it will be sufficient to mention Cyprian, Eusebius, Basil the Great, Ambrose, Augustine, Ephrem, Epiphanius, and Gregory of Nazianzen; all of whom testify that the practice prevailed in their days, as one coming to them from immemorial antiquity.

It would be a grave omission were I here to neglect to observe, that all the ancient Christian communities, though separated from the Catholic Church for many centuries, have carefully retained this holy custom; many and various as are the ways in which they have departed from the truth, all of them—Nestorians or Armenians, and all the different sects of the Monophysites, have at least remained faithful to this external part of the divine depositum; all bear witness to the antiquity of the practice; and all reject the novelty of purgatory.

Nor must I omit to mention one great Englishman, who in himself is, to my thinking at least, a host: the truly great Dr. Johnson: that he raised himself far from the

* Philarete, *Choix de Sermons et Discours*, vol. ii. p. 25. Paris, 1866.

vulgar traditions of Protestantism, and prayed for his deceased wife is well known, and his prayer which he composed for the purpose is framed on the very model of the primitive forms.

I shall conclude with a recapitulation and summary of the orthodox doctrine:

Besides the general judgment at the last day, there is a particular one, on the death of each man; after which he receives an earnest and a foretaste of the recompense due to his works.

Until the last judgment, the souls of the departed are not in a condition to receive their final and definitive sentence in consequence of their separation from the body; since "body and soul are one man."

Although we are taught by the Church, and in Scripture, that various abodes are assigned to the souls of the departed faithful, and also that they have a foretaste of bliss, joined to the sight of Christ's countenance; yet our knowledge of their precise condition is extremely limited. As for the souls of the wicked, we conclude from Scripture, and from analogy, that there are also various degrees of punishment in store for them.

We are nowhere taught by the Church, in Scripture, in the Fathers, or in holy tradition, that there is any such thing as a purgatory, or *status expiationis.*

Considering our ignorance of the state of the departed previous to the last judgment; our certain knowledge of the infinite mercies of God which are *over all His works,* and the fact, that *the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much,* we conclude, that the efficacy of prayers and suffrages for the faithful departed must form an integral part of the doctrine of the Communion of Saints.

Scripture is an infallible guide to the practice of piety; we are taught therein to pray for all men, excepting only those who are guilty of *sin unto* death. Inasmuch, therefore, as there is no prohibition in Scripture to pray for the dead, we conclude from the principle *exceptio firmat regulam,* that prayers for the dead are neither offensive to God, nor useless to man.

The reprobation of prayers for the dead, indulged in by Protestants, could only be justified on the supposition of their possessing far more information—both respecting the limits to the efficacy of prayer, and the precise condition of the de-

parted, than it is possible for them to do, in the very nature of things.

Consequently, the doctrine of the Orthodox Church, which is that of the primitive Church, is the only true one, and the conclusions at which we have arrived are equally removed from dull scepticism, obstinate negation, and impertinent curiosity. S.

ESSAYS ON RE-UNION.

ART. V.—*Essays on the Re-Union of Christendom.* By Members of the Roman Catholic, Oriental, and Anglican Communions. Edited by the Rev. F. G. LEE, D.C.L., Editor of the First and Second Series of "Sermons on the Re-Union of Christendom." With a Preface by the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford. London: J. T. Hayes, 1867.

[SECOND NOTICE.]

To those who have watched the rapid and successful progress of the Re-union movement during the past twelve years, nothing can seem more remarkable than the silent manner in which its principles have made their way amongst dignitaries of the Established Church. Not simply the younger Clergy have adopted and propagated them, but men of position, mark, and years have openly acknowledged that Corporate Re-union is the true cure for our present manifold difficulties and miserable failings. The recent Sermon on Unity, by Archdeacon Churton, is an example of this, and its perusal enables us to judge accurately of the progress that has been made. So, too, is the existence of the Eastern Church Association. Here men of moderation, knowing very likely extremely little of the Orthodox Church, can stand forward as Re-unionists, without committing themselves too completely to a desire for re-union with Rome, and so avoid such perplexing difficulties as might otherwise arise. For it is strange how, even amongst scholars and students, in the atmosphere into which so many of us find ourselves born, all objects are distorted and all first principles perverted, when our relations with the Mother Church of Rome are being considered. That which is dark seems light, that which is light appears dark. History, which might all have been written by John Foxe the romancer, has to be unlearnt, so perverted with diabolical craft has it been to the purposes of Error and Misrepresentation.

But the most notable example of the advance of Re-unionist principles is manifest in the gathering and Acts of the Lambeth Conference. The year 1867 will be one of the most notable in the History of our National Church. What many have dreamed of and prayed for, has been enacted before our eyes. Never

since the Reformation, possibly never before in England, has such a gathering taken place. It is the first breaking up of the ice of Division, the first indication of returning Spring.

We quite believe that some of those who have taken part in the Conference scarcely realise to what they are committed by their acts and deeds: but this fact only serves to show how marvellously and sweetly, in wonderful order, and in might majestical, the work of restoration, visible unity, and peace, is being brought about by the Divine Guide of the Universal Church.

Nothing, humanly speaking, has so tended to the success already effected, as (1) the establishment of the A. P. U. C. through which the holy Sacrifice and prayers are being constantly offered for the restoration of visible oneness to the Christian family; and (2) the dissemination of books and treatises on this great question. The late Mr. Pugin, Cardinal Wiseman, Mr. Phillipps de Lisle, Mr. Ffoulkes and Mr. Oxenham have served the good cause well from the Roman Catholic side of the wall. Deep into the hearts of thousands their profound remarks and learned dissertations have sunk, so that a school amongst the most intelligent and influential of their co-religionists has been safely and securely founded. On the Church of England side, too, men have certainly not been idle. The A. P. U. C. and Re-unionist publications have already worked a moral miracle. The aspect of the question is entirely altered. Our rulers begin to see what is required, and towards which men are stretching out their hands with faith and anxiety. So when the general body of the faithful are prepared—the work of preparation we cannot expect will be an easy task—the work of Corporate Re-union will be effected before men know that it is done. The Lambeth Conference of 1867 does but forecast the scene of light and life prophesied of, of old, for a future year.

Of the various publications issued by those who have been the pioneers in this great movement, few seem to us calculated to effect greater good than the volume of Dr. Lee's *Essays on Re-union*. Of their contents and purport our readers have some idea, gathered from a notice in the UNION REVIEW of last September. But on that occasion, of the twelve essays, only four, together with the Introductory Paper by Dr. Pusey, were noticed, leaving eight to be considered in the present article.

That by Mr. Perceval Ward, which was read at the notable Re-union Conversazione, in Conduit Street, London, April, 1866, is a very remarkable literary effort, inasmuch as, with

the strictest impartiality, he began by recognising the many difficulties that exist, and by his sage experience and creditable erudition went a considerable way in pointing out how they may be legitimately and rationally removed. The ignorance of our teachers, the ingrained Protestantism of the nation, the studious dishonour of the Blessed Virgin so current amongst many, are some of the leading difficulties of the Anglican position. Added to these are the Filioque question with Greeks, popular ideas of "Roman corruptions," Ultramontanism, and a thousand and one political difficulties; and we have some notion of what Mr. Perceval Ward attempted to grapple with in his clever paper. That he has rendered great services to the cause by its publication we know on the testimony of one of the most distinguished French bishops, while its remarks are reported to have been referred to more than once at the Lambeth Conference.

As a specimen of its literary power and politic pleas we subjoin a very telling passage, regarding Anglican difficulties:—

"There is a lower depth still, and we must look steadily into it before we can fully appreciate the work before us. I believe that the fundamental difficulty which underlies the whole is the unintelligent or indefinite belief of our upper and middle classes (I am not now including the clergy) in the very first principles of the Christian religion. We marvel sometimes that so few can realize the doctrine of the Sacraments, that the vast majority seem so entirely unable to comprehend even what is meant by the Real Presence in the Most Holy Eucharist, that English congregations seem for the most part to have no conception of the simplest idea of *worship*. But we should cease to marvel if we remembered, or if we knew, what I fear is the true cause of this. We must go back for it to their shadowy belief in a doctrine that must precede all others in a Christian's faith—a doctrine without which he simply has no religion, and can have none. We shall find it in their unconscious half-belief in the great cardinal verity of the *Incarnation*.

"The great body of the upper and middle classes of England do not *realize* this mystery of all mysteries—they do not *deny* it; nay, they would probably assert it in words, but they do not *realize* it; they do not really understand what it means. There have been many proofs of this of late in the favour with which publications have been received which ignore it; books of travel in the East which discuss Mahometanism; a considerable amount of the popular novels of the day, when they incidentally touch on matters of faith; and graver works also, such as the first of the condemned 'Essays

and Reviews.' Nor can I believe, even giving the fullest credit for a good intention, that a book like 'Ecce Homo' could have been received in a community of well-instructed Christians with the fervour with which that book has been hailed by so large a portion of English society. It is most true, and we may be thankful for it, that our people are not yet prepared to receive the open blasphemies that find favour upon the Continent; they are as yet, thank God! too *superstitious* for that. But what we have reason to complain of is, that their religion is only a superstition; it is not a clear, intellectual reception in faith of the great *fact* upon which the Gospel rests. They do not in reality know the meaning of these words: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' And why is this? They have their English Bible, their English Prayer-book, and the Creeds. How *can* they be ignorant of the great verity which is the key-note, as it were, to the teaching of all these? One great cause no doubt is the undogmatic way in which religion has been taught among us, the absence of real catechizing, the loose wordiness of popular preaching, the timid reserve of even good people. But there is another cause which I believe to have very much to do with. It is this: *that our people have been studiously taught to dishonour the Blessed Virgin.* It is a moral impossibility for any human being to adore the Son, who thinks and speaks with no reverence of the Mother.

"I have lived much in Italy and seen many things in the devotion of the people there which have distressed and grieved me; but the worst superstition that can be seen in Italy, of which the Blessed Virgin is the object, is far less shocking to the Christian heart than the shameful scorn heaped upon the Mother of God by otherwise religiously-minded Protestants. The Italian superstition may, I much fear most surely does, keep from him the fulness of loving trust; but *this* is an impassable bar to any real adoration of Him. It is impossible that irreverent thoughts of her can coincide with adoring thoughts of Him. One great test of the truth of what I am saying is, that her incommunicable title, the name by which the Church has ever expressed her honour, by which so many generations have hailed her Blessed, as alone "Theotokos," alone the Mother of God, cannot be received by the great body of English Christians. Not many years ago, at the request of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and without any remonstrance from any single Bishop that was publicly heard, this her wondrous title, which, if it be not hers of right, has deceived the faithful in all ages, and He in Whom they have trusted is not the Eternal Son, is not the Second Person of the Almighty Trinity,—this incommunicable title of the Most

Blessed Virgin was struck out of books published by the old and wide-spread Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

"By that act I need not say that the most venerable of all Church of England Societies is committed to an overt act, however unconsciously, an overt act of *heresy*."

And another, on the state of affairs upon the Continent, full of charity and full of hope :—

"The enemies of the Church upon the Continent are working out her greater true power and greater true glory. They may drive the Pope from Rome and keep him from his own for many years; but it will only be (I will venture on the prophecy)—it will only be for his return to be hailed by a re-united and concordant Church. His absence from the city which has been the focus of so many intrigues will materially help to scatter the intriguers. His loss of temporal power, or at any rate, of temporal independence,—for *power*, properly so called, he has none—but his loss of temporal independence will make him throw himself more entirely upon his spiritual authority; thus will that authority be tested, and reduced to its due proportions: whatever the undivided Church accorded to him of old will be again freely offered, and thus Re-union be made possible.

"There is an old prophecy which may be taken to shadow forth what I am now anticipating as likely to arise from the troubles which surround the Primatial See.

"That prophecy foretells the characters and fortunes of the later Popes by assigning a motto to each—a motto which expresses, or is supposed to express, some striking trait in that character, or those fortunes. Whatever may have been the value of others, the motto given to the present Pope is most strikingly applicable. It is 'Crux de Cruce'—'a cross from the Cross.' His troubles have indeed arisen from his position in the Church. If Mastai Ferretti had been only an elected temporal Prince, he might have been King of Italy; but he believed himself to be the Vicar of Jesus Christ, and as such he could not remove his neighbour's landmark; nor could he take part with infidels, blasphemers, and robbers of churches, even to work out his country's good; and so he could neither lead nor follow in the political troubles that have marked his reign. Then again he was Defender of the Faith, and as such he could not permit that religious license within his dominions which in these days is held to be, and indeed may be, necessary to liberty. Thus not only could he not rule over united Italy, which men, in the days of his popularity, had dreamed he might have done, but he lost much even of his own dominions, and will probably lose all. Hence it may be seen how true it is to say that his cross comes from

the Cross. He is the chief cross-bearer of Christendom, and hence his troubles. But when all political strife shall have ceased with the last remnant of political power; when the College of Cardinals shall have become more cosmopolitan, and less Italian; when the Primate shall belong to the whole Church, and not so specially to Italy; then, with the pure, unmixed, spiritual authority, will come clearer light and a simpler course of duty.

"The motto ascribed to the next Pope is 'Lumen de Cœlo' —'Light from Heaven.' If that hold as good as this, we shall see glorious times indeed. As Solomon followed David, the sage, the warrior, the builder of the temple—him who was so often driven from Jerusalem, the philosophic Preacher—him, who, with whatever failings, was the man after God's own heart; so may it be again; and when this true Soldier of the Cross shall be called to rest from his long and weary warfare, then, with peaceful times may come the counsels of peace. With the East opening her heart once more to her sisters; with England prepared by her long training of a hundred years; with the Priesthood of Italy purified by persecution; with old superstitions, both of priest and people, in France and Germany, and perchance even in Spain, rubbed off by rough contact with the 'oppositions of science,' both truly and 'falsely so called;' when all this shall be, and it is neither presumptuous nor unreasonable to believe that it will be—then may we look for the 'Light from Heaven.' No camarilla of worldly-minded politicans, lay or sacerdotal, to hide it under the bed of their ambition; but set on high, upon the Candlestick of the entire, undivided Church, an emanation of the True Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world, this Light from Heaven shall bring a glorious day to all the nations of the earth."

2. Dr. Lee's Essay, "1636 and 1866," almost exclusively historical, contains a parallel between the Re-unionist Revival of King Charles I's. reign and that of the present period. It brings before us a considerable number of new facts, and refers us to authorities and sources of information little known, which are at once full of interest and importance. Having always held that the farsightedness of "the martyr monarch," coupled with the heroic resolution and supernatural faith of Laud, Montagu, and others, saved the Church of England from becoming a mere Protestant sect; it is extremely interesting to note how thoroughly the idea of Corporate Re-union, instead of individual secession, had all along taken possession of the minds of the leading politicans and ecclesiastics of that period. Dr. Lee's Essay, which contains

abundance of materials for an independent volume, has constant reference to valuable State Papers and rare original documents, many of which, in the keeping of private families, would no doubt throw still further light upon the remarkable religious revival of the seventeenth century. The fault of the Essay is that it aims at effecting too much in a small compass, and leaves its readers to draw the parallel set forth and point the moral indicated for themselves, which all readers are not quite competent to attempt. It deserves a careful perusal.

3. One of the most remarkable papers in the volume is that entitled "Defects and their Remedy in Re-union." More than usually thoughtful, singularly fair and impartial, it contains a train of reasoning calculated to soften prejudice and break down the barriers of separation; while the extreme lucidity of its suggestions adds greatly to its intrinsic value and literary charm. The practical position of the Church of England is thus sketched with a master's pen:—

"Englishmen in general have long been in the habit of piquing themselves upon possessing the best form of religion existing in the world. Their Liturgy and Articles they have devoutly believed to be the most primitive and Scriptural extant; their form of worship the most acceptable to God; their clergy the most learned and deservedly-beloved of all denominations of Christian ministers; their parochial system the wisest possible in theory, and better carried out in practice than in any other country; their devotion all the better for being moderate and sensible, eminently calculated to make respectable and prosperous families, avoiding enthusiasm and all other forms of fanaticism. Their Church preserves better order than other 'Protestant' bodies, and it avoids the superstitions of Roman and Greek Christianity. In fact, it hits upon just the right mean between teaching too much and too little; between unbelief and too great devotion to the unseen, between living entirely for this world, and neglecting it for the next.

"Being such a perfect system, it must seem astonishing that the poor do not appreciate it more, if it were not assumed that it is impossible for the uneducated to be capable of understanding its advantages. Its Liturgy might be perfect, and written in harmonious words beautiful to the scholar's ear, but it is not the language in which the uneducated mind can alone offer its heartfelt but clumsy worship. Its Articles might as well have been written in Hebrew for anything the poor can make of them; the clergy have often been kind and benevolent friends, and might satisfy the wants of a soul that could be satisfied with prayers couched in general terms, and with consolation and advice that appealed to the intellect; but those

among the poor who in their earnestness had forgotten their conservatism, looked about helplessly for something—they knew not what—but a something which they embraced rapturously when they thought they had found it in the form of Wesleyanism. The moderation, the respectability, the avoidance of enthusiasm and extremes, were just the things they found fault with, or rather which did not win their admiration or their confidence. The poor want something they can see and feel, and they have been met (practically though not theoretically) by the Reformed Church of England with nothing that they can see, and their feelings have been only appealed to through their dull understandings, and consequently have not been reached at all. Their instinctive conservatism has hitherto kept the majority of those that stay connected (for we cannot say in communion) with the English Church, but few clergy would care to calculate how many in their parishes would remain faithful, if some other religious body were placed in possession of the churches and tithes. In the class above the labourer, embracing all grades of tradesmen, the conservative spirit has always been less apparent. The facts that they are struggling to rise to a rank above them, and that the beginnings of education have shaken their belief in the mystic superiority which real rank retains over its inferiors, have greatly tended to encourage notions of an universal equality, and a disbelief in all superiority that cannot be reduced to something tangible. Money is essentially tangible, therefore they respect money. A religion which claims to have a priesthood whose authority over themselves is founded on something intangible, has no charms for them, and so the choice of a dissenting minister, who can be followed or not at will, appears to them more consistent with habits of mind which will only acknowledge a superiority if the individual can show that he personally deserves it. The materialising influences of trade also conduce to make Puritanism the most popular religion among the middle class.

"The upper ranks have till lately adhered to the English Church under the form in which she has been practically presented to them during the last three centuries. Now, increase of devotion is drawing one class to desire something higher and deeper than the conventionalities which satisfied past generations, and increase of thought is driving another class to demand (in the absence of belief in dogmatic authority) proofs such as cultivated intellect alone can require, and such as the Catholic Church was never intended to supply. The consequence is on one side a reversion to the central Christian Church, of which the English Church is perceived to be but a local phase, and on the other, the repudiation of a system which, to those who deny the perpetual Presence of the Holy

Spirit, only presents a mass of unsupported and old-fashioned assertions. The third, or Puritanical party, is rapidly becoming absorbed into the other two. The piety of many of its members (which has hitherto been its support), is now passing away, or perhaps it would be truer to say that that which is genuine among them is receiving its reward by conversion to a higher faith."

4. In the eighth Essay, Mr. Oxenham supplements his celebrated "Letter to Father Lockhart," by a "Postscript" to it, in which he not only defends the statements made in the same, but amplifies his arguments and retorts upon certain of his critics with considerable power and pungency. This "Postscript," written with an accurate knowledge of both the strong and weak points of Anglicanism as well as of Roman Catholicism, is a most eloquent exposition of Re-union principles, by one who, though a loyal and sincere Roman Catholic, is at the same time an honest and most able opponent of the extreme ultramontane theory. We quote a very thoughtful and forcible passage, rife with practical teaching and golden suggestions :—

"Two prominent facts confront the gaze of those who look out on the religious aspect of the world around us. On the one hand there is the Antichristian movement. Its footfall is heard in our streets, its mark may be traced on our literature, its mutterings float on the passing breeze. Opposed to this, and partly in consequence of it, there is a centripetal movement towards Unity. Men feel that the argument once so effective to awe the indifferentist and silence the sceptic has become almost a dead letter to us. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum* was not so much an inference from theological principles as an appeal to visible facts. S. Augustine hardly needed to argue for an indivisible Church when he could point to an undivided Christendom. But with East arrayed against West, Teuton against Latin, Saxon against Celt, the old watchword dies powerless on our lips. While it provokes the sneer of the infidel, it sounds even to the well-disposed as the echo of 'a lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play cunningly on a musical instrument,' for men hear the words and regard them not. And hence arise, directly or indirectly, nearly all those terrible evils of disunion I have elsewhere had occasion to enumerate. Thoughtful and earnest minds, perceiving this, yearn for a restoration of unity. It is impossible but that all who really believe in Revelation should be drawn more closely together in presence of a common foe. The consciousness is forced upon them that no available support may be lightly dispensed with in the conflict now becoming daily

more imminent, no strength wasted in defending untenable positions. If the trumpet give an uncertain sound it cannot lead to victory.

"The need for some central authority has been conspicuously, I might almost say amusingly, illustrated in the recent Colenso controversy in the Established Church, and was uneasily recognised in the debates in Convocation on the subject. It was felt on both sides that there should be some right of appeal from the decision of a metropolitan, and while one party were striving to erect the See of Canterbury into a kind of Anglican patriarchate, another was no less strenuously bent on claiming the fulness of papal authority for the British Crown. At the same time there is manifestly a growing disinclination to accept any basis of Union which does not find its roots in history and its justification in the deepest needs of the Church and the individual soul. Such tests can only tell in favour of the primacy of the central See, but they expose the supreme unwisdom of seeking to clothe with its usurped authority the theories of individuals or of schools which wake no response in the conscience and intellect of modern Europe.

"At such a time our obvious duty would seem to be to explain difficulties rather than to multiply them, scrupulously to avoid whatever may create fresh differences or exaggerate those already existing, and above all to approach our separated brethren in a spirit of genuine cordiality and with the honest desire of discovering some common ground to meet upon. The words of the great Christian poet who was taken from us last Holy week, with a prayer for unity on his dying lips, may well be applied to the present phenomena of our threatened, distracted Christendom

> "Is this a time to plant and build,
> Add house to house, and field to field,
> *When round our walls the battle lowers,*
> *When mines are hid beneath our towers?*"

Man's necessity is God's opportunity. And if it be true, as a keen observer has lately remarked, that 'in the infidel literature of Europe there are ominous threats and undisguised passions which remind us that the spirit which cried of old, *Christianos ad leones*, is not extinct,' we may recognise in that very fact a divine call to unity clearer than any which has made itself heard in the world since the last great schism. It may be that the stern ordeal of persecution is the only adequate penance to cure our proud self-seeking and teach us to understand each other."

5. The anonymous Essay that follows, entitled "The Spirit in which Re-union should be sought," is signed "De Q." Treating a very important detail of the great question with

breadth and originality, it points out to Church-of-England people the immense importance of realizing what is the true relation between the various portions of the Church Universal. Until this is learnt, and learnt accurately, the insolent and self-satisfied spirit of national insularity (a spirit incarnated in the Anglo-Continental Society,) will, like a blighting miasma, poison and wither all that is fair and lovely and of good report amongst us. The writer opposes with a hearty good-will the narrow and selfish pride of the modern Anglican school, and this in a spirit of charity and good-will most pleasant to contemplate. The argument of the Essay and some of its most useful and practical suggestions may be learnt from the following:—

"And now let the principle be faithfully applied to the Church of England. Unless Anglicans are prepared to claim for their communion an exclusive revelation, special privileges, and peculiar divine graces, over and above those dispensed in other Christian countries, we cannot look for exemption from such imperfections as are so readily discovered by some amongst ourselves elsewhere. No portion of the Christian Family has undergone such considerable changes as the Church of England during the past four centuries. There is nothing moreover on *à priori* grounds to warrant us in supposing that our standard of Christian faith and practice is that which on authoritative investigation must infallibly be accepted as true by Roman Catholics and Orientals before visible Re-union is possible. When other communions are so freely and sometimes so ignorantly criticised, and when so many of our prelates patronize and support a schismatical organization like the Anglo-Continental Society, we must, in even-handed justice, be at least prepared to admit that it is just within the bounds of possibility that we too may have varied from the principles and practices of the Catholic Church as a whole. We cannot dispute the probability that our own national standards or insular peculiarities may on inquiry be found to have deviated somewhat from the ancient standard of Catholic truth; for not the Church of England, but only the Universal Church is infallible. We should, moreover, be prepared frankly to allow that one popular school of interpretation—that for example which exalts the comparatively modern Articles at the expense of the more ancient liturgical formularies, which profanely links the names of Cranmer and Anne Askew with those of S. Polycarp and S. Agnes—goes even further in the direction of irregular divergency from ancient standards than the national formularies themselves appear to warrant. For instance, many both of the negative and positive propositions of our Articles are of very inferior

importance as well to the statements of the Creeds as to the traditional customs and beliefs of other parts of the Christian Family. No one, for example, and consequently, could hold that it is of the same moment to accept a certain view of the 'Doctrine' of the two Books of Homilies, as it is to receive *simpliciter et ex animo*, the Catholic dogma of the Resurrection of the Body. The Doctrine of the Homilies may or may not be 'godly and wholesome,' whereas the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body is one of the most crucial and important of specific Christian truths. Or again, it can hardly be as necessary to accept the opinion that the Sacrament of Orders has 'not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God,'—a proposition maintained by the Twenty-fifth Article,—as to receive, in a spirit of faith, the cardinal verity that our Blessed Saviour is 'God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, Begotten not made.' Other instances of the comparative unimportance of the numerous propositions of the Thirty-nine Articles in comparison with the Creeds of the Church Universal will occur to every one who has become convinced that as the Church of England rightly disclaims national infallibility, so the theological opinions which are peculiar to herself must, of course, be explained by the consentient voice of Christendom if they should appear to be out of harmony with the general faith of Catholics everywhere and at all times. All this being admitted, therefore, it follows that, remembering our losses and in true humility, we should ever be on the watch to crush out self-satisfaction and to labour practically for the extension of the Re-union spirit, by the spread of which alone—in conjunction with the grace of God—we can hope for an answer to our daily petitions for Peace. No word should fall from us which could in any degree widen the breach which exists. The best and not the worst motives should be ever imputed to the acts of those who are now unhappily separated from us, and a common principle at all times sought for, by which, in the future, united action might be honestly attempted. When so much is held in common, a sincere and Christian hope should be expressed that, upon inquiry, still more points of agreement might be discovered. In charity, too, we should pray and labour. We should implore the Blessed Paraclete, Who is the 'Guide of the Church and Light of the World,' to overrule the infirmities, the ignorance, the narrowness, the violence and the bitterness of our local sectionalism, to the furtherance of the great work of restoring visible Unity to the Church Universal; so that the unspeakable blessings which descended upon mankind in the early ages of Christianity, may again, like the dew, water abundantly the parched ground, now too barren and desolate."

6. In our judgment, however, the most remarkable Essay

in the whole book, not even excepting that by the venerated Dr. Pusey, is one from the pen of Mr. Phillipps de Lisle, entitled "Corporate Re-union." Here is set forth the principle on which Roman Catholics can act in promoting the great work hitherto so signally blessed. After pointing out that the Church in all ages has constantly and uniformily sanctioned the principle of Corporate Re-union, some exceedingly valuable remarks are so made as to explain to members of his own portion of the Christian Family what is in contemplation and what it is hoped may be effected.

To readers of this REVIEW, the most interesting portion will be that in which Mr. De Lisle's part in establishing the A.P.U.C. is given at some length. The correspondence with Cardinal Barnabo, printed in full, while it completely disposes of the unkind insinuations and unjust charges which were made against Mr. de Lisle by the anonymous scribes of certain Roman Catholic serials, indicates with sufficient clearness the readiness with which the authorities at Rome would be prepared to consider terms of peace, when the time for formally making them has arrived.

We must quote one eloquent and very forcible passage, on account of its powerful reasoning and commendable charity:—

"From this correspondence it will be abundantly evident, that the highest authorities in Rome approve of the principle of a Corporate Re-union, provided such a Union be carried out on sound and orthodox principles. In fact, if it were not for the senseless opposition of superficial men, who misunderstand or misrepresent our object, it would seem superfluous even to argue the point, for it is clear from the whole history of the Catholic Church, that in every period of her career it has been her hearty desire, and her constant policy, to reunite to her communion, not merely individuals, but whole bodies of separated Christians. And how otherwise is it possible for heresy and schism to be rooted out, how else are all mankind to be brought into the profession of the saving truths of Catholicity? If our zeal be confined to individuals, and not extended to the bodies to which they belong, we may reunite a few, but schism and division will be perpetuated: and Christians, instead of becoming One, as Christ and His Father are One, will remain in a condition of perpetual warfare and conflict, fighting against one another, instead of striving to subdue the whole world to the Faith of Jesus Christ. What is it but the divisions of Christendom, which have robbed Christendom of its distinctive Christian character, and of all collective action in the world for a common Christian purpose? What is it,

but the same divisions, which render a Christian polity impossible in any Christian country?

"How can there be Christian legislation on the matter of secular education, so long as the community is subdivided into so many contending communions, each anathematizing the other? The indifferentism of modern legislation is evidently a great evil, but how can it be avoided, when nations are split up into such a variety of sects? The infidelity of the present generation, increasing every day, is an evil greater still, but who can wonder at it, when the foundations of all belief are undermined by the recriminations and the furious controversies of contending Christians? Who can wonder at the continued increase of immorality and crime when Christians disagree about the very Fountain from which alone any intelligible distinction between Right and Wrong can flow? What else is the true secret of the anti-social and revolutionary principles of the present day? And, on a larger scale still, to what else are we to attribute the utter disregard of public right, of the sanctity of treaties, and of international obligation, which manifestly spring from the weakening of the religious Principle, as the weakening of that has itself sprung from the anarchy of religious division? Writers, like those in the *Dublin Review* or like the furious zealots of *The Monde*, complain of religious division, and would cure it by lighting once more the fires of the Inquisition, but they forget that in the very nature of things nothing but *argument* can exterminate *error:* they would deal with error as if it were a physical rather than an intellectual evil, and as if force could convince the human mind: they fall into the old blunder of Pagan legislation in defiance of all the lessons of history, and they forget all the experience to be derived from the facts and precedents everywhere exhibited during the last three centuries. We, who advocate Corporate and dogmatic Re-union, are assuredly the very last people to advocate political and religious indifference—the very last to deprecate or decry Christian legislation, or to assert the impious maxim that statesmen owe no responsibility to the Law of God, and that the State should be indifferent to Truth, whether natural or revealed. But we do contend that there is but one effectual way for the State to uphold Divine Truth, and that is not by the exercise of penalties, but by giving the freest development to the Church of Christ in her preaching department and in the exercise of her Ministry. It is only by the preaching of Union, and the force of religious argument, that religious error, wherever it exists, is to be vanquished, as it is equally certain that sanctity and holy example are the strongest arguments of the Truth, from which they spring.

"Some Catholics, however, much as they would admit these

general principles, contend against such efforts as ours in favour of Re-union; because, say they, we do not go far enough. Why do we talk only of reuniting the three great bodies of Christians, Latins, Greeks, and Anglicans? Why not include the various sects of English dissenters, why omit the German Lutherans, or the French and Swiss Calvinists? Our answer is plain: we exclude no one, no corporate body of Christians, however heterodox, from our Re-union scheme; but we feel that if once the three great bodies, which still profess so much that is common to each, could be led from what they already agree upon to a still higher and closer agreement, we should have laid the foundations for a Union which in the end would swallow up all minor differences, to replace them with that legitimate diversity of human opinion on open questions, which it was never the intention of the Divine Founder of Christianity to coerce nor to efface. So far from it, one of the most remarkable characteristics of Christianity, as foretold by the Royal Progenitor of the 'Son of David,' was, that it should be 'circumdata varietate,' as worded in the venerable version of the Vulgate. Revelation does not annul the freedom of the human mind, it regulates it and conserves it, as law regulates and upholds the exercise of civil liberty. Atheism is no more the genuine fruit of free thought than anarchy and plunder are the legitimate offspring of social freedom. The proofs and the evidences are different, but the force of religious argument is as strong and as convincing within the limits of its own sphere as the inductions of science in establishing the grand facts elucidated by scientific research. Is it a mark of a free and intelligent mind at the present day to reject the Copernican Theory? Religious conviction is not elaborated by the same method as the definitions of science, but it is no less sure nor less cogent, when the mind of man will give it a fair and legitimate consideration. The Christian Church has never asked for more, though it is a necessary characteristic of her message to mankind, that they and they only are to benefit by it, who will listen to it and profit by it."

The second part of the Essay contains, as we learn, a most impartially-drawn paraphrase of a correspondence between its author and a very distinguished convert to Rome, in which, notwithstanding the force of retort and strength of purpose of the said convert, we cannot but allow that Mr. de Lisle has by far the best of the argument. Want of space compels us to omit any quotations from it, but we cannot do other than draw our readers' special attention to this most important part. The concluding words of the Essay—a most devout prayer of Mr. John Gother, the examplary author of "The Sinner's Complaint to God," most fittingly bring it to a close.

7. Mr. Mossman's paper, "Ritualism in its Relation to Re-union," is written from a high Catholic standing-point, with an accurate knowledge of our manifold needs, with much faith and evident charity: but is not altogether free from the charge of being superficial. Far more might have been made of the subject, more especially as our enemies have not failed to discover the intimate bearings of Ritualism to Re-union.

8. A competent theologian of the diocese of Constantinople states, in terse and plain language, "The true Basis of Re-union," which is nothing more nor less than the basis owned by all Catholic members of the Church of England. If Re-union is ever to be effected, it will be based on the unquestioned and unquestionable Faith of the undivided Catholic Church. For if the teaching of Rome now be what the teaching of Rome was in the ninth century, it follows that the teaching of Rome in the ninth century is identical with her teaching in the nineteenth. But furthermore, the Church of England at the present time, like the Holy Eastern Church, teaches what was taught ten centuries ago. "Things, therefore, which are equal to the same thing, are equal to one another." Rome and England hold One, *i.e.* the Catholic Faith. Q.E.D.

So may it turn out to be. Amid many perplexing difficulties, where dangers are great, and reliance on a human arm or human policy are proved impotent, the voice of those in the forefront must be but a simple repetition of the solemn injunction of God to Moses of old: "Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward." Through the wall of waters, and the palm-less desert, where the sunshine is blinding and the way long, men of faith and hope, forgetting the things that are behind, shall pass on and press forward until they cross the Jordan in humble confidence, and reach that land of Corn, and Wine, and Oil, beyond, where Peace and Unity, crowned with "Charity which never faileth," shall be found to be perfect, enduring, and eternal.

FRAGMENTA VARIA.

No. I.—The Encyclical Letter of the Bishops at the Lambeth Conference, 1867.

"*To the Faithful in Christ Jesus, the Priests and Deacons, and the Lay Members of the Church of Christ in Communion with the Anglican Branch of the Church Catholic.*

"We, the undersigned Bishops, gathered under the good providence of God for prayer and conference at Lambeth, pray for you that ye may obtain grace, mercy, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour.

"We give thanks to God, brethren beloved, for the faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love towards the Saints, which hath abounded amongst you; and for the knowledge of Christ which through you hath been spread abroad amongst the most vigorous races of the earth; and with one mouth we make our supplications to God, even the Father, that by the power of the Holy Ghost He would strengthen us with His might, to amend amongst us the things which are amiss, to supply the things which are lacking, and to reach forth unto higher measures of love and zeal in worshipping Him, and in making known His Name; and we pray that in His good time He would give back unto His Whole Church the Blessed gift of Unity and Truth.

"And now we exhort you in love that ye keep whole and undefiled the Faith Once Delivered to the Saints as ye have received it of the Lord Jesus. We entreat you to watch and pray, and to strive heartily with us against the frauds and subtleties wherewith the faith hath been aforetime and is now assailed.

"We beseech you to hold fast, as the sure word of God, all the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; and that by diligent study of these oracles of God, praying in the Holy Ghost, ye seek to know more of the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour, very God and very Man, ever to be adored and worshipped, Whom they reveal unto us, and of the will of God, which they declare.

"Furthermore, we entreat you to guard yourselves and yours against the growing superstitions and additions with which in these latter days the truth of God hath been overlaid; as otherwise, so especially by the pretension to universal sovereignty over God's heritage asserted for the See of Rome,

and by the practical exaltation of the Blessed Virgin Mary as mediator in the place of her Divine Son, and by the addressing of prayers to her as intercessor between God and man. Of such beware, we beseech you, knowing that the jealous God giveth not His honour to another.

"Build yourselves up, therefore, beloved, in your most holy faith; grow in grace and in the knowledge and love of Jesus Christ our Lord. Show forth before all men by your faith, self-denial, purity, and godly conversation, as well as by your labours for the people amongst whom God hath so widely spread you, and by the setting forth of His Gospel to the unbelievers and the heathen, that ye are indeed the servants of Him who died for us to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world.

"Brethren beloved, with one voice we warn you: the time is short; the Lord cometh; watch and be sober. Abide stedfast in the Communion of Saints, wherein God hath granted you a place. Seek in faith for oneness with Christ in the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood. Hold fast the Creeds and the pure worship and order, which of God's grace ye have inherited from the Primitive Church. Beware of causing divisions contrary to the doctrine ye have received. Pray and seek for Unity amongst yourselves, and amongst all the Faithful in Christ Jesus, and the good Lord make you perfect, and keep your bodies, souls, and spirits, until the Coming of the Lord Jesu Christ.

(Signed)

C. T. Cantuar; M. G. Armagh; R. C. Dublin; A. C. London; C. R. Winton, C. St. David's; J. Lichfield; S. Oxon; Thomas Vowler St. Asaph; A. Llandaff; John Lincoln; W. K. Sarum; John T. Norwich; J. C. Bangor; H. Worcester; C. J. Gloucester and Bristol; E. H. Ely; William Chester; T. L. Rochester; Horace Sodor and Man; Samuel Meath; H. Kilmore; Charles Limerick Ardfert and Aghadoe.

Robert Eden, D.D., Bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness, Primus; Alexander Ewing, Bishop of Argyll and the Isles; Charles Wordsworth, D.C.L., Bishop of St. Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane; Thos. G. Suther, Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney; William S. Wilson, Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway; Thomas B. Morrell, Coadjutor Bishop of Edinburgh.

F. Montreal, Metropolitan of Canada; G. A. New Zealand, Metropolitan of New Zealand; R. Capetown, Metropolitan of South Africa; Aubrey G. Jamaica; Thomas, Barbadoes; J. Bombay; H. Nova Scotia; F. T. Labuan; H. Grahamstown; H. J. C. Christchurch; Matthew Perth; Benj. Huron; W. W. Antigua; E. H. Sierra

Leone; T. N. Honolulu; J. T. Ontario; J. W. Quebec; W. J. Gibraltar; H. L. Dunedin; Edward, Bishop Orange River Free State; A. N. Niagara; William George Tozer, Missionary Bishop; James B. Kelly, Coadjutor of Newfoundland; S. Angl. Hierosol.

John H. Hopkins, Presiding Bishop of Pr. Ep. Church, in the United States; Chas. P. McIlvaine, Bishop of Ohio; Manton Eastburn, Bishop of Massachusetts; J. Payne, Bishop of Cape Palmos and parts adjacent; H. J. Whitehouse, Bishop of Illinois; Thos. Atkinson, Bishop of North Carolina; Henry W. Lee, Bishop of Iowa; Horatio Potter, Bishop of New York; Thomas M. Clark, Bishop of Rhode Island; Alexander Gregg, Bishop of Texas; W. H. Odenheimer, Bishop of New Jersey; G. T. Bedell, Assistant Bishop of Ohio; Henry C. Clay, Missionary Bishop of Arkansas and the Indian Territory; Jos. C. Talbot, Assistant Bishop of Indiana; Richard H. Milmer, Bishop of Alabama; Charles Todd Quintard, Bishop of Tenessee; John B. Kerfoot, Bishop of Pittsburg; J. P. B. Wilmer, Bishop of Louisiana; C. M. Williams, Missionary Bishop to China.

J. Chapman, Bishop; George Smith, late Bishop of Victoria (China); David Anderson, late Bishop of Rupert's Land; Edmund Hobhouse, by Bishop of New Zealand.

No. II.—Letter to the Prelates of the Holy Eastern Church from the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The following Letter, which is a translation of the original Greek text, has been addressed with the foregoing Encyclical Letter to the Eastern Prelates, by the Archbishop of Canterbury:—

In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

To the Patriarchs, Metropolitans, Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons, and other Beloved Brethren of the Eastern Orthodox Church, Charles Thomas, by Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan, sends Greeting in the Lord.

"If one member suffer," the holy Apostle says, "all the members suffer with it; if one member is honoured, all the members rejoice with it." Wherefore We having called to a Conference Our Brethren the Bishops of that part of the Catholic Church which is in Communion with Us, and which by God's grace is spreading itself forth in all regions of the earth; and having come together with them for the sake of united prayer and

deliberation, and having written with all readiness of mind and brotherly love an ENCYCLIC EPISTLE to the Priests and Deacons and Laity of our Communion, notify to you as Brethren in the Lord what has lately taken place among us, in order that ye also may rejoice with Us in our Oneness of mind.

Furthermore, We send to you a copy of the said Epistle, in order that, when ye read it, ye may see what is the mind of the Anglican Church concerning the Faith of Christ, and that ye may know that we acknowledge, and, God willing, are resolved to maintain firmly and immoveable, all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as the sure Word of God; and to contend earnestly for the Faith once for all delivered to the saints; and to hold fast the Creeds of the One Holy Apostolic Church; and to keep pure and undefiled the Primitive Order and Worship, as we have received it from our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and from His Holy Apostles; and that with one mind and one voice we reject and put far away from us all innovations and corruptions contrary to the Gospel of Christ, Very God and Very Man; and that we earnestly desire to fulfil the preaching of His saving Truth to all nations of the earth, in order that the kingdom of the world may become the kingdom of the Lord and of His Christ.

May the Lord grant unto all to have the same mind in all things, that there may be "One Flock and One Shepherd."

Given at Lambeth Palace, on the 28th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1867.

No. III.—CONDEMNATION OF POPE HONORIUS AS A HERETIC BY THE SIXTH GENERAL COUNCIL.

HONORIUS is placed among the heretics, with Sergius, Phyrrus, and the Monothelites, by the Sixth Synod, according to the Roman Edition of Habertus:

"First: in Session xiii., in which the letter of Honorius, after being thoroughly understood, IS CONDEMNED.

"Second: by the Sentence of the Council, HONORIUS, POPE OF OLD ROME, IS DECLARED A HERETIC, along with the Monothelites, Sergius, Phyrrus, Petrus, Paulus, Petrus and Theodorius Pharanita: to which sentence Theodore and George, Priests, and John, Deacon, LEGATES OF THE SEE OF ROME, SUBSCRIBED.

"Third: the Council exclaimed ANATHEMA TO Sergius and HONORIUS, in the same Session.

"Fourth: in the Prophoneticum, addressed to Constantine Pogonatus, the Emperor: 'in the anathema we justly include Theodore Pharanita, Sergius and Paulus, Phyrrus along with Pater that fill the high places in the City of Constantinople, and Cyrus to boot, the Bishop of Alexandria, and with them HONORIUS, the President of Rome, as follower of the same.'

"Fifth: the Synod, in a Synodical Epistle addressed to Pope Agatho, signifies to him, that it had pronounced Anathema against even Honorius.

"Sixth: in the Edict of the Emperor for the publication of the Synod, the same Honorius is reckoned the third among the heretical Bishops, and is also said to be A PROMOTER OF HERESY. (αἱρέσεως βεβαιώτης.)

"Seventh: what I am much surprised at, LEO, THE SECOND POPE, in a rescript to the Emperor Constantine, RECKONS HONORIUS WITH OTHER HERETICS. 'As also Honorius, who did not illustrate this Apostolic Church with the doctrine of Apostolic tradition, but, WITH PROFANE TREACHERY, RASHLY ASSAILED THE IMMACULATE FAITH, and all who are dead in their error, We anathematize.'*

(Eighth:) "The Seventh Synod, in a Synodical Epistle to the Emperor and Empress, also reckons Honorius among heretics, along with Sergius, and strikes him with anathema.

"Ninth: Hadrian, the second Pontiff, with the Eighth Synod, subjects him also to anathema; according to the version also of Anastatius the librarian, who also reckons the same (Honorius) among the Monothelites in the life of Leo II." See Habertus, *Pontifical Eccl. Græc.*—Paris, 1643, p. 565.

No. IV.—LETTER FROM A FOREIGN PRELATE TO THE GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE A.P.U.C.

[*Translation.*]

RESPECTED AND DEAR SIR,—I beg that you will do me the favour of receiving my sincere acknowledgments, tendered in all gratitude, for the present of books which reached me in safety several days ago. I am likewise greatly obliged for the documents in various languages of your Association, which I have read with the deepest satisfaction, and with gratitude to the Father of Light for the progress in true Catholic sentiment evidenced as going on in Great Britain, through the instrumentality of the same—your Confraternity for prayer.

I have long thought that, in the designs of the Almighty, a very important work might be done through the active ones of Great Britain; and that the Christian principle, so ably defended and intelligently set forth by your great theological authors, would be the means of drawing you near to other Christians defending the same principle, now alas! everywhere impugned in other parts of Christendom. That thought has

* These are the very words of Pope Leo II.: "Sed et Honorium, qui hanc Apostolicam Ecclesiam, non Apostolicæ traditionis doctrina illustravit, sed prophana proditione, immaculatam fidem aggressus est, et omnes qui in sui errore mortui sunt, anathematizamus."

been the seed of Hope. So that of which you have enabled me to read, in the most interesting publications forwarded, as now taking place, I daily pray may be in deed completely accomplished as God Almighty wills, for the honour and glory of Him, and for the salvation of those immortal souls for whom Jesus Christ His Son shed His Blood.

He ever bless you and yours for your unremitting labours in the good work of extending Catholic Truth and promoting Unity, and make us all one Sheepfold with one Pastor, for His Most Blessed Name's sake. Unto Whom, in peace and charity, I commend you for safe keeping. Amen.

✠ John Baptist,
Who prays every day for the visible unity of all Christian people.

To my friend, M. the Rev. F. G. Lee, Doctor in Law, Secretary General, A.P.U.C., at London.
November, 1867.

ORIGINAL POETRY.

OUR LADY OF THE SNOWS.

I.

The world is very foul and dark,
And sin has marred its outline fair;
But we are taught to look above
And see another image there!
And I will raise my eyes above,
Above a world of sin and woe,
Where sinless, griefless, near her Son
Sits Mary on a throne of snow.

II.

Mankind seem very foul and dark
In some lights that we see them in;
Lo! as the tide of life goes by,
How many thousands live in sin!
But I will raise my eyes above,
Above the world's unthinking flow,
To where so human, yet so fair,
Sits Mary on her throne of snow.

III.

My heart is very foul and dark,
Yes, strangely foul sometimes to me
Glare up the images of sin,
My tempter loves to make me see.
Then may I lift my eyes above,
Above these passions vile and low,
To where in pleading contrast bright
Sits Mary on her throne of snow.

IV.

And oft that throne, so near our Lord's,
To earth some of its radiance lends;
And Christians learn from her to shun
The path impure, that hell-ward tends.
For they have learnt to look above,
Above the prizes here below,
To where, crowned with a starry crown,
Sits Mary on her throne of snow.

V.

Blest be the whiteness of her throne
That shines so purely, grandly there,
With such a passing glory bright,
Where all is bright and all is fair!
God make me lift my eyes above,
And love its holy radiance so
That some day I may come where still
Sits Mary on her throne of snow!

THE OFFERING.

I culled one day a bouquet fair,
  A rose baptised in matin dew;
A sprig of jasmine scented rare;
  A moist-leaf'd musk-plant flower or two.

Geraniums trail'd along the mould
  With forked pegs minutely set;
A sweet-named blossom—marygold,
  And several tufts of mignonette:

Some honeysuckle, which entwined
  Its amorous arms the trellis round;
Vale-lilies with their heads declined
  Like pensive nuns toward the ground.

Snap-dragons, whence I drove the bees,
  And fringy pinks diffusing spice;
And white and purple pied heartease;
  And foxglove, dark with spots like dice:

A perinwinkle's azure eye,
  And garden-daisies' velvet studs;
A deep-dyed flaunting peony
  And saffron dahlia, in their buds.

And hyacinths of motly hue
  That bourgeon'd on the crocus tombs,
And monkshood petals lurid blue,
  And lavender, to blend perfumes:

And green relief for hues so bright
  I found in tendril'd leaves of vine;
And lance-long grasses streak'd with white
  Around my stems compress'd did twine.

"My bouquet is too gay to keep;
  'Twill fade," I said, "with fading day;
And ere my good intentions sleep
  I wish to give my flowers away."

I turn'd and welcomed close at hand
  A marble sculptured niche and shrine,
Saw in the niche my Mother stand,
  And in her arms the Babe Divine.

"Go, fragrant blooms," I said, "and lie
  At Jesu's and at Mary's feet;
There while ye live, there while ye die,
  Exhale whate'er ye have of sweet."

LITERARY NOTICES.

In a pamphlet of seventy-six pages '*On the Relation of the Anglican Church to the Orthodox*,' (in Greek) by Nicholaus M. Damalas, (London, Clayton and Co., Bouverie Street, 1867), the writer has stated the case between the Anglican and Eastern communions with praiseworthy candour and much force. It is to be dedicated "To the September Synod of the Church of England," entreating it to lose no time in stating its opinion clearly respecting the Church of Christ; whether it is, in short, such as it is described in the Thirty-nine Articles, or as described by the Synod in laying claim to Apostolical succession for the Church of England. Afterwards, having gone over the various theological and anthropological articles of doctrine, on which there would seem to be some sort of divergence between the two communions, he comes at length to the conclusion that the principle points to be settled are, first, that at which he has already glanced in his dedication: and secondly, the question of the procession of the Holy Ghost. How, in casting off at the Reformation so many mediæval corruptions and usurpations, the authorities of the Church of England should have allowed one so unscriptural, so lawlessly introduced, in open contempt of the canons and definitions of the undisputed Councils, as the 'Filioque' clause, to remain in her version of the Nicene Creed, and to be copied from thence into several of her public formularies, he cannot for the life of him comprehend, and calls upon the author of the "Eirenicon," and those who hold similar views, to explain. Union cannot advance one step, in his opinion, till the Church of England abandons this reckless innovation for the genuine creed in its pristine form. We think it high time that this all-important question should be seriously stirred amongst us; and are grateful to M. Damalas for coming forward so appositely to challenge us to the enquiry, and for giving us so clear an insight into what are considered by his side our weak points. We heartily

recommend all Re-unionists to study these for themselves in his interesting and kindly-meant pamphlet.

A very charming as well as a very learned volume is Mr. Baring-Gould's second series of *Curious Myths of the Middle Ages*, (London: Rivingtons). It displays on the author's part not only a considerable acquaintance with unusual mediæval literature, but an extended knowledge of ancient and modern mythology, more especially of that which has reference to the universal belief of Christendom. The subjects treated of in the book before us are as follows:—"S. George," "S. Ursula and the Eleven Thousand Virgins," "The Legend of the Cross," "Schamir," "The Piper of Hamelin," "Bishop Hatto," "Melusina," "The Fortunate Isles," "Swanmaidens," "The Knight of the Swan," "The Sangreal," and "Theophilus." An Appendix furnishes an account of "Pre-Christian Crosses" and "Stripping the Dead," both very remarkable and full of interest. Of these several will commend themselves to Catholics as very reverently written; while the amount of curious information provided renders the book worthy not only of a careful perusal but of being preserved on the library shelves. We know few volumes more attractive than those of which this is the second series; and offer the editor our warmest commendations as well for the pains he has taken in doing his work in a thoroughly scholar-like manner, as for the admirable tone manifest throughout.

Mr. Baird's *Sermons at S. Gabriel's Mission Church*, (London: Mozleys,) are deserving of praise for more reasons than one. Lucidly written in terse and well-constructed sentences, they are admirably plain and sufficiently theological; while practical exhortations are not wanting to point the excellent moral of them. Here and there, however, the metaphors are a little obscure and confused: while "a saving faith" (p. 90) is an untheological and slipshod term, out of place in the mouth of a Priest of the Church Universal. Cant, however attractive to some minds, should be avoided as the flesh-pots of Egypt. As a whole the book deserves warm commendation.

Mr. Cradock Newton's small volume, *A Rhymer's Wallet*, (London: Bennett), is very far beyond the average of ordinary books of verses. Its author evidently possesses no common poetical ability; while the taste displayed and the knowledge of the *ars poetica* evidenced, are very remarkable. Added to this, the sentiments are thoroughly Christian, and do credit to his heart as well as to his head. We deeply regret that want of space necessitates the omission of a quotation we had marked for our readers' satisfaction.

Mr. Hodges, of Frome, has published *The Imitation of Christ*, in a neat and well-printed volume, stitched in cloth, for sixpence.

The series of Contrasts by Mr. Mowbray of Oxford, entitled *The Reformation and Deformation*, improves as it proceeds. Our readers will find them very amusing and instructive, more especially that entitled "Our Spiritual Pastors and Masters."

A very cheap *Handy Book of Floral Decorations*, from the same publisher, can be commended as well for the clearness of its directions as for the number of its excellent illustrations.

Mr. S. B. James's Essays, *The Church and Society*, (London: Houlston and Wright), evidently the work of a respectable Evangelical who is casting his skin and slowly becoming a High Churchman,—though heavy, crude and rambling, full of rash judgments upon the Ritualists, and not always accurate in facts,—penned by a person who is evidently sincere, a constant observer of men and things in the neighbourhood of Windsor; are written with some ability and much painstaking care. A more accurate knowledge of the springs and workings of the Catholic Revival, however, would do the writer good. On this point he is simply in Egyptian darkness, and not unfrequently writes sheer nonsense.

We cannot say much for Mr. Stephen Jenner's book of verses, *The Holy Child and other Poems*, (London: Longmans), though we are free to confess that it contains several pleasant exercises, and evidences the possession on its author's part of a devout mind, some poetical taste, and a certain ability for verse-making. There are touches of commonplace Protestantism here and there, which detract from the value of the poems in which they appear; but on the other hand, several noble sentiments are to be found, and, in some places, a vigour of expression and thought, which is, however, unsustained generally throughout the book.

Some person has gathered the actual sayings of our Blessed Lord out of the New Testament, and reprinted them under the title of *The Divine Teacher*, (London: Smith, Elder and Co.), with sufficient explanatory sentences to make a connected whole. With certain persons this publication will be found useful. It is certainly very neatly printed.

An admirable edition of *The Canons of the First Four General Councils*, (London: Parker and Co.), has just been issued in Greek and English. Such a publication should be in the hands of all the clergy. The present volume is enriched with several plain and valuable notes of some theological and ecclesiastical importance, and is well printed and issued at a cheap rate.

Bishop Cosin's Devotions, issued for one shilling by the same publishers, will no doubt be largely circulated. It is well got up in every way.

There is nothing at all remarkable in the two volumes of

Short Sermons for Family Reading, (London: Parker and Co.), by Mr. Burgon. Nevertheless they are devout and practical; with a considerable amount of plain Scriptural exegesis and homely instruction calculated to edify and do good. Their author appears to be one of the most eccentric persons living as regards the use of italics, brackets, and dashes (—). So multitudinous are these on almost every page, that they become positively perplexing and bewildering to an ordinary reader. A pedantry like this might with advantage be given up. But then, on the other hand, pedants grow more pedantic with the growing years.

Of single sermons we have received a considerable number. 1. The most remarkable is one on *Catholic Unity* (Palmer) by Mr. Stuart of Munster Square, which abounds in point, sound reasoning, and pertinent arguments. The Appendix, full of interest and good writing, expands the idea of the sermon, and is a masterly statement of the Anglican position. Without at all committing ourselves to all Mr. Stuart's *dicta* (he is by no means so hopeful of seeing Corporate Re-union a fact as we are ourselves,) we can commend his sermon as one which is at once soundly Catholic and argumentatively powerful. It can be had for sixpence. 2. *On the Punishment of Death for Wilful Murder* (Rivingtons), by Dr. C. Wordsworth, Archdeacon of Westminster, is learned, solid, and well stated as regards its much-needed warnings. 3. The Dean of Chester's *Discourse at the opening of Special Evening Services in the Cathedral* (Chester: Phillipson,) is remarkable both for plainness and point. 4. Mr. Burgon's sermon on *The Lambeth Conference*, (London: J. Parker and Co.,) though in parts powerful and solemn, is not a little involved in style. Moreover some of its theological statements are loose, and the writer's notions a little insular. That in Mr. Burgon's judgment it is charitable to speak of the "Church of Rome" as "licentious" is a misfortune. For the sermon's merits, whatever they may be, are overlooked in such ill-natured remarks as that specified. 5. Mr. R. Tyrwhitt's two sermons, *The Anglican Conference*, from the same publishers, far less pretentious and very far less wordy, are vastly superior to that by Mr. Burgon. There is a dignified simplicity about them which is remarkably attractive while their expression of faith and hope is full of consolation. Both the sermons are excellent and very readable. 6. The Archbishop of Westminster's discourse, *Christ and Antichrist*, (London: Longmans,) whatever may be thought of its principles, is full of vigour, eloquence and power. Some persons are ever ready to maintain that, as a preacher, the Archbishop is inferior to the Archdeacon. For ourselves we cannot think so. Some of his grace's recent sermons are, in every respect, remarkable. That before us, while attractive for the rhythm and music of its language, is even more remark-

able for the profundity of its thoughts, and the dignified enunciation of neglected Christian truth. 7. Mr. Mackonochie's *Advent Sermon before the University of Oxford*, (London: Simpkins,) a judicious, appropriate, and searching discourse specially addressed to undergraduates, is a type of sermon far too much neglected by University preachers. It is full to overflowing of Catholic teaching and valuable practical exhortations. 8. That delivered from the same pulpit by Mr. William Stubbs, *Evil Days*, (London: Parker and Co.,) would safely have borne compression. It is somewhat wordy and diffuse, though the general drift of it is not otherwise than plain. Similar warnings are needed, but the true remedy for such evils is Corporate Re-union, a subject we commend to Mr. Stubbs' special consideration. 9. This remark brings us to Mr. Le Geyt's sermon, *Union and Dis-union*, (London: Bosworth,) preached on behalf of the A. P. U. C., a production of unusual power and ability. The conclusive answers to objectors and carpers here provided deserve to be widely read, for they are as convincing as they are forcible. We commend it to our readers' special attention. 10. Archdeacon Jones, of York, publishes an University sermon on *The Mystery of Iniquity*, (London: Parker and Co.) From what we hear, it is to be feared that this "mystery" is working very energetically in the diocese of York, where the doctrine of God manifest in the flesh is denied by a beneficed clerk and a friend of the Archbishop. Before this amiable archdeacon again preaches at Oxford, he might strive to practise in Yorkshire. It is not creditable to "our pure and apostolic branch" of the Church that Socianism should be taught from her pulpits, or that an archbishop and his archdeacon should wink at such teaching. An exposition of sound principles is all very well, but prompt action would be far better. 11. Mr. H. Meynell's *Sermon on the Death of the Bishop of Lichfield*, (London: Bemrose,) is a simple and touching record of the last public acts of a very pious and painstaking prelate—on whose soul may God have mercy. Amen.

Mr. Churchwarden Williams's practical letters, *What Constitutes a Church?* (London: Rivingtons) full of sound common sense and vigorous thought, are very creditable to their author. The vulgar Protestantism recently stirred up in the diocese of Salisbury is simply Unbelief clothed in the cast-off rags of the Anglican Reformers. Mere negations will never satisfy people. Such do not need stones, but bread.

Lord Nelson's *Family Prayers, with the Psalter* (London: Parker and Co.) founded on a good liturgical model, will be welcomed by many for household purposes and domestic use. They have already gone through four editions—a sufficient testimony to their practical value.

Mr. Marshall's concise *Account of Sandford* (London: Parker and Co.), an admirable specimen of archæological inquiry and exposition, is deserving of patronage and commendation. Displaying both research and judgment, it is executed in a masterly manner, and over and above its local merits is of some interest on general antiquarian grounds.

Dr. Hessey's *Catechetical Lectures on the Prayer Book* (London: Parker and Co.) are exceedingly well done, and merit our hearty approval. They are certain to become popular.

Mr. Bosworth, of 215 Regent Street, has published the first volume of *The Church News*, well bound, for five shillings. This is no great sum for a good record of Ecclesiastical intelligence compiled and set forth from a Catholic point of view.

No member of the Church of England interested in the work of the Church of South Africa, should fail to read the Bishop of Capetown's unaffected but masterly *Statement* (London: Rivingtons) of which a second edition is just published. We cannot say that the Bishop of St. David's and Dean Stanley are free from the charge of having perverted facts. Such tactics, however, only serve for a while; afterwards, when the Truth comes out, it makes its way and does its work.

Dr. Prebendary Irons has most wisely supplemented his able treatise "The Bible and its Interpreters" by a new volume *On Miracles and Prophecy*, (London: Hayes,) in which, if there is nothing peculiarly novel (a great recommendation in these days of novelties) we obtain a very powerful, well-arranged and intellectual argument, sustained throughout with power and ability, in favour of Christianity. Not only are facts well marshalled, and abundance of sound information wisely provided, but the reasoning with regard to prophecy is very complete and crushing. A little more boldness would not have been out of place in reference to ecclesiastical miracles—a subject sadly needing a broader and more intelligent treatment than it has hitherto obtained amongst members of the Church of England. The "Table of Prophecies" provided at p. 69, in which their New Testament use is set forth, is exceedingly valuable. In fact, the volume generally is a most acceptable contribution to the library of the parish priest, where it most certainly ought to be very generally found. Not the least valuable part of the book are some "Minor Notes" appended.

There is much in the Bishop of Brechin's *Commentary on the Thirty-nine Articles*, (London: Parkers,) which will enable young students to take a far more accurate idea of them than is generally adopted. Everywhere they are interpreted so as not to contradict the decrees of Trent, with some ability, no

little originative ingenuity and great casuistical cleverness. Many Anglo-Catholics will regret that Bishop Forbes has not taken the more vigorous line of recommending that subscription to them be quietly dropped; for it is most undoubted that their retention must be a great bar to Corporate Re-union, whenever arrangements are actually made for its consummation. It might have been wise, likewise, as it certainly would have been just, if the bishop had condescended to acknowledge his great obligations to Sancta Clara. There is not a single comment in which the able treatise *De Natura, Gratia*, &c., has not been ransacked for explanatory exegesis, and this at least ought to have been admitted. *One* reference to "Sancta Clara," as we humbly judge, is not a sufficient acknowledgment of all that has been borrowed, and carefully wrapped up in new language before re-production again. We recommend the book, notwithstanding this personal defect, as able and valuable.

We are much pleased with the first part of a learned, carefully-written and practical volume on *The Church, the Sacraments, and the Ministry*, (London: Saunders, Otley, and Co.,) from the pen of Mr. W. R. Clark, Vicar of Taunton. A considerable amount of argumentative power is displayed throughout the book, and no small knowledge of the kind and character of objections continually being made to the Church's system, is apparent on every page. With some readers a certain abruptness of style and want of polish will be a specific recommendation—with others a defect. The present volume is mainly occupied with a consideration of the Sacrament of the Font. We trust that nothing slip-shod, obscure or *jejune* will be forthcoming when the Holy Eucharist is being treated in Part II. That Mr. Clark is a competent and original writer few will deny. His present volume is one of his best. Let him complete it on the same Catholic basis and lofty platform and he will do well.

The *British Churchman*, (Church Press Company,) full of interesting and instructive matter, steadily improves. The woodcuts, however, might be better. Some of the church interiors are very bad.

A very remarkable book is *The Kiss of Peace*, (London: Hayes.) Its author maintains, and maintains with great logical power and eminent literary success, the most reasonable proposition that wherever the real Objective Presence of our Blessed Saviour in the Eucharist is held, details as regards the "how" and the "mode" do not interfere with oneness of faith. So that England and Rome are practically agreed as to the doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar, only differing in their use of terms, or using terms in different senses. This of course was the corollary deduced from Archdeacon Wilberforce's masterly

"Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," and has been largely accepted by Anglo-Catholics ever since. It is to be regretted that the ignorant misrepresentations and superficial statements which are so commonly made against our Roman brethren for holding "a carnal presence," are so continually repeated; for they are not only a breach of charity but an utterance of that which is not true. All this, and much more, is here set forth with great clearness of statement and unusual accuracy of language. Every step in the line of reasoning is taken with due care and eminent consideration of what has to be assumed and proved; and the result is a treatise, concise, lucid, and logical, of the very highest value and importance. We do very earnestly recommend it to our readers' attention as one of the ablest and most important contributions to the Literature of Re-union that has been published for some time. It is most appropriately dedicated conjointly to Dr. Newman of the Oratory and to Dr. Pusey.

Mr. Sedley Taylor's *Reply to the Kiss of Peace*, (London: Macmillan,) is almost entirely taken up with a painstaking, elaborate, and minute inquiry into the private opinions regarding the Holy Eucharist held by Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and similar energetic persons who lived in the sixteenth century; and who apparently, as we note, did not know their own minds on a variety of theological subjects for six months together. What we Catholics of the nineteenth century have to do with their shifting and fleeting "views" it is not easy to see; nor, furthermore, is it easy to read with ordinary patience the dull and uninteresting unbelief set forth in Mr. Taylor's ponderous production. An attempt to galvanise into sham life the Protestant corpse is more than an herculean feat.

Lessons of Middle Age, (London: Longmans), a series of Miscellaneous Essays by A.H.K.B., are shrewd, decently written, and not unattractive papers, which will be useful in whiling away a dull half-hour. The religious views set forth, however, are eminently vapid and shallow; misty, too, and ghostlike, with no dogmatic stamina of any sort or kind. On the other hand, some of the criticisms of the services of our English Cathedrals are clever, pointed and just. And a few, but only a few, of the Essays are decidedly above commonplace.

In *Lay Suggestions on Modern Preaching and Preachers*, (London: Rivingtons), we have a really clever and systematic Essay, full of practical suggestions by one who is at once a keen observer and a competent critic. It should be widely read, as we trust it will be.

Mr. Harris' *Historical Religion and Bible Revelation*, (London: Parker and Co.,) is clever, but seems based on a fallacious

argument. Unless the infallibility of the undivided Church be maintained, Bible Christianity, or indeed any Christianity, soon fades away. Strauss and Renan have developed the opposite principle to its legitimate conclusions, and it will not do to give up the old landmarks or the ancient method. If so we are at sea, rudderless, chartless, and with little chance of reaching port.

The Chasuble not Anglican but Roman, (London: Rivingtons,) is a small treatise on a subject important in some of its bearings, by a clergyman who knows little or nothing of what he thinks it wise to write about. His calm presumption and complete want of information are exactly on a par.

A recent convert's *Appeal to High Churchmen*, (London: Burns,) is too slipshod and superficial to have any weight whatever. The writer could have hardly expected to do justice to the momentous questions in dispute in a pamphlet of sixteen pages. And even from his own point of view he certainly has *not* done them justice.

Mr. Colin Lindsay's two lectures, *On the Church of God and Objective Worship*, (London: Church Press Company,) contain a very able statement of the Catholic position, written with judgment, discretion and power. In parts they are remarkably deep and politically sound. The comment on the making a K. G. of the Sultan is most just but most melancholy to read. These lectures would bear re-delivery more than once, and we trust they may have a wide circulation.

Paul Gerhardt's *Spiritual Songs*, translated by Mr. John Kelly, have been published by Strahan of Ludgate Hill. Well translated, with scholar-like ability and judgment, they will be acceptable to persons of a pietistic turn of mind, who prefer vague to dogmatic statements. The book is printed and got up in good taste.

Mr. A. Williams' *The Liturgical Reason Why*, (London: Hayes) courts comparison with Mr. C. Walker's volume. This the author should not have done. He has, however, provided a useful book, containing many valuable explanations and much sound information: so that it will be found useful for school prizes, village libraries, and general parochial edification. Here and there some of its statements might be a little more accurate, and others a trifle more complete. On the whole it is at once useful and trustworthy.

Mr. Husband's *Catholic Tracts for Home and Parish Distribution* (London: Palmer), written with unusual vigour, are very far above the average in point, and in argument and attractiveness.

The Messrs. Parker are printing some of Mr. Keble's *Sermons, Occasional and Parochial*, in shilling parts. Many of them were preached more than fifty years ago. They need no recommendation from us.

We are glad to note that the *Churchman's Companion* (London: Masters) is, as usual, full of interest. Moreover its bulk is greatly increased, while the material in no degree deteriorates.

A second volume of Mr. Bennett's very timely and valuable series *The Church's Broken Unity*, has just been published by Mr. Hayes. It is taken up with a consideration of the Anabaptists, the Independents, and the Quakers—whose various errors and peculiarities are pointed out with great plainness and no sparing hand. The accounts are both historical and doctrinal, and enter at great length into a variety of details which are too much neglected by those who should be warning the faithful against them. Their style is plain, intelligible and popular, and we quite believe the series generally will be one of the most useful for parish libraries of any series that has been issued for many a day. We dislike the nicknames of "Romish" and "Romanist" which sometimes occur in it.

Well-intentioned, pietistic, written with some command of the English language, and not deficient in practical teaching, we cannot, nevertheless, recommend Mr. John Allen's sermons which are entitled *Parting Counsels* (London: E. Stock), because they display an utter absence of any proper respect for the Sacramental system of the Catholic Church. Moreover, the true idea of worship is not even conceived, much less accepted, while the remarks on the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar at page 245, and on Devotion to our Lady at page 157, are extremely painful and sad to contemplate. The writer evidently makes them in ignorance. From the remark in the opening sentence of the Sermon on "Retirement" we imagine that Mr. Allen keeps the Jewish Sabbath; for his day of rest, he tells us, is at the end of the week. If so this is a remarkable modern example of Judaizing. When will gospel Truth flourish again in this land?

Mr. G. F. Prescott's *Short Sermons* (London: Mozley) though not remarkable in any way, nor calling for special notice, may be commended for their sober style and generally sound principles—though we cannot but take note that the trumpet gives a somewhat uncertain sound with regard to the Sacrament of Penance. One special charm lies in their terseness and brevity—a point of no mean importance.

ART. VI.—THE RECITATION OF THE DIVINE OFFICE.

[COMMUNICATED.]

"ALL Priests and Deacons are to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer, either privately or openly, not being let by sickness, or some other urgent cause." This is a law of the Church of England, imposed by her on all ecclesiastics in her communion. The practice it prescribes is no national peculiarity, but one common to all the Churches of God, and among them to the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, and Germany, with whom, in her Thirtieth Canon of 1603, she claims a substantial identity.

We purpose in the following pages to note and analyse, as briefly as may be, the obligations of English ecclesiastics as regards the recitation of the Divine Office; and inasmuch as all Churches of the West are at one as to the precept, we shall, in order to a right interpretation of that precept, give an outline of the general and received teaching of Western Christendom.

If the general practice of English ecclesiastics is not in conformity with the theory and precept of the Church of which they are the accredited agents, and is opposed to the practice of their brethren in the Continental communions, let the scandal be humbly confessed, and zealously and quickly remedied.

That the scandal exists is notorious. How grievous that scandal is, it will be our object to show; and any attempt to remove such a scandal is, let us to remember to our joy, a step towards our reunion with the Churches of Western Christendom, which, let us say it out openly, honestly and bravely, have more boldly fought the good fight, and more stedfastly kept the faith, than have we.

We desire to follow their practice in respect of the Divine Office, which we admire and devoutly thank God for: and therefore, in the light of that practice, let us examine the precept, which is common to all of us.

In the first place, what are the Canonical Hours? The Canonical Hours are vocal prayers, instituted by the Church, to be recited, in accordance with her prescript, by persons set apart for that purpose. In this definition four points demand

our notice. 1. They are *vocal prayers*, and not merely mental. And so those who say them with the heart only and not with the lips also, do not satisfy their obligation. 2. They are *instituted by the Church*, to distinguish them from those private prayers which every individual of the body of the faithful is at liberty to select and use at his discretion, and as his devotion prompts. 3. They are said *to be recited in accordance with her prescript*, because public prayers ought to be recited, at a time and in a form and manner approved and appointed by the Church. And, 4, *by persons set apart for that purpose*, because they are offered in the name of the whole Church. Hence they are called *Public Prayers*, whether they are recited in choir or not.

They are called "*Canonical Hours*" because they are to be recited at certain hours in accordance with the Canons of the Church.

The volume which contains them goes, in the Latin Church, by the name of the Breviary, as exhibiting *in brief* the oracles of the Holy Scriptures, the teaching of the holy Fathers, and a record of the deeds of the holy Saints. It is, besides a compendium of longer prayers which were more anciently in vogue.

They are called also the Ecclesiastical, or the Divine Office; the Ecclesiastical Office—as said in the name of the Church: the Divine Office—as instituted in order to the Divine Worship.

The Canonical Hours are seven in number, namely, matins with lauds, prime, terce, sext, nones, vespers, and compline. Matins is divided into three parts called nocturns. These are followed by a fourth part which takes the name of lauds. Matins with lauds and vespers are called the Greater or Great Hours. The rest are called the Lesser or Little Hours.

The whole Office, moreover, is divided into Night Hours and Day Hours, *Nocturnum et Diurnum*. The Night Hours embrace the three nocturns and lauds, and are so called because they were formerly recited during the night. The Day Hours embrace all the other parts, and are so called because they were recited during the day.

The Canonical Hours seem to have been distributed into seven, in order that seven times a day Public Prayers should be offered to God, in accordance with the words of the Psalmist, "Seven times a day do I praise Thee": and also in order that at these seven several hours of the day might be set forth the Seven Mysteries of the Passion of Christ, as in the following verses:—

Hæc sunt, septenis, propter quæ psallimus, Horis.
Matutina ligat Christum, Qui crimina purgat:
Prima replet sputis: causam dat Tertia mortis:
Sexta cruci nectit: Latus Ejus nona bipartit:
Vespera deponit: tumulo completa reponit.

Having determined what the Canonical Hours are, the next question is, What was their origin? And here we must make a distinction. When we speak of the Canonical Hours, we refer either to the substance of these hours, that is, to certain prayers to be recited at divers hours of the day in the name of the Church; or we have in view that special and particular form in which they are wont to be recited at the present day. If we refer to their substance, many doctors are of opinion that their origin was Apostolic, for very frequently is there mention made in the New Testament of certain hours at which the Apostles were wont to give themselves unto prayer. We read in the Acts of the Holy Apostles, that Peter and John went up to the Temple at the ninth hour, being the hour of prayer; and the Holy Spirit is recorded to have descended upon the Apostles as they were praying at the third hour. But if we have in view their later form, we find it to have been given by the hands of, among others, the following Pontiffs: Damasus in the fourth century, Gelasius in the fifth, Gregory the Great in the sixth, the ninth of the same name in the thirteenth, Pius the Fifth in the sixteenth, and in the seventeenth century Clement and Urban the Eighth.

So much as to the origin of the Hours. And now as to the obligation of reciting them. This obligation does not arise *ex jure Divino*, for it is found neither in Holy Scripture nor in Divine tradition nor in the teaching of the fathers. It rests on immemorial custom, which has in time attained the force of the most weighty law; and this custom has been confirmed and commended by the decrees of various councils. So clearly does this custom represent the mind of the Church, that all theologians are agreed that a transgression of it by the omission of the recitation of the Canonical Hours, or any notable part of the same, is a mortal sin. What constitutes and what excuses such a transgression will be stated further on; meanwhile, who are bound to recite the Hours?

Three classes of persons are so bound. 1. The first comprehends those who are bound by the obligations of Holy Orders; 2. The second, those who are bound by the obligations of a Benefice; 3. And the third, those who are bound by their religious profession.

122110

As to the first class, all clerks in Holy Orders are bound to say the Hours under pain of mortal sin: and this, even if they have been excommunicated, suspended, degraded, or are shut up in prison.

As to the second class, all beneficiaries, even although not yet in Holy Orders, are bound to recite the Hours in terms of the contract, express or implied, on which they hold their benefices.

And as to the third class, the common opinion is, and it is so commonly taught that it would be temerarious to assert the contrary; that all professed religious intended for the choir, although not yet in orders, also professed monials or nuns, are bound, under pain of mortal sin, daily to recite the Divine Office, at least in private. We have said *professed religious intended for the Choir*, for neither are novices bound who have not yet professed the rule, nor are associates, albeit professed, who are intended for corporal labour and not for the recitation of office.

We come now to consider the time, the order, and the form to be observed in the recitation of the Hours. And first, as to the time. It is sufficient, in order to the avoidance of mortal sin, that the Offices be said between midnight and midnight. According to the primeval institution, Matins was said about midnight, Lauds at dawn, Prime at sunrise, Terce midway between sunrise and noon, Sext at noon, Nones midway between noon and sunset, Vespers at sunset, and Compline at nightfall. But this precise order is not now observed.

In order to avoid venial sin, the recitation ought to be made at the time assigned by the Church, unless it be hindered by a reasonable cause. Vespers should be said between noon and midnight, the other hours between dawn and midday, except Matins, (as to which presently,) and Nones, and, according to some, Sext also, which may be recited after midday.

We have said, *unless hindered by a reasonable cause.* That cause must be at once honest and useful—as, for instance, preparing for or hearing sermons, risk of a supervening occupation, greater devotion, or a time more fit for study. And here we cannot do better than give heed to the rule of S. Antonine: When office cannot be said by reason of occupation it is better to anticipate than to procrastinate; for to anticipate belongs to providence, to procrastinate belongs to negligence.

As to Matins and Lauds, they may, even without cause,

be said the day before—namely, after Vespers and Compline; for so far as the ecclesiastical office and the celebration of solemnities is concerned, the day begins with Vespers, and the time after Vespers belongs to the following day.

As to the order in which the Canonical Hours should be recited, that order should be observed in which they are placed in the book. Whosoever, without just cause, inverts this order, sins, as violating a precept. But such inversion does not invalidate the office, neither does it amount to mortal sin, inasmuch as the whole substance of the office is preserved.

Among just causes which excuse an inversion of the usual order in saying office, are the following: 1. If one be invited by a friend to say with him the Matins for the following day, before he has himself said Vespers. 2. If one having lost his book should recite from memory the hours before Matins, if their recitation could not conveniently be deferred. From these examples, what a just cause is may readily be seen.

The question may be considered here, What is one to do who has said the wrong office? He will have done so either advertently or inadvertently. If inadvertently, he will not have sinned, neither will he be obliged to repeat the office—with this exception: that if the office he has said be notably shorter than the office he ought to have said—for instance, if he has said the office proper to a saint in place of the Sunday office, he must add something by way of compensation, say nine psalms of the first Nocturn. This is the common opinion, and is moreover reasonable. But the change may have been made advertently and without cause; and if there have been a substitution of a notably shorter office in place of the office of the day, it will amount to a mortal sin, inasmuch as the precept will have been fulfilled neither in form nor in equivalent.

As to interruptions in saying office, they amount to venial sin, if made without just cause. Among just causes are the following: 1. The benefit of others, or one's own, if delay will prevent such benefit accruing. 2. Urbanity, charity, or obedience to the call of superiors. 3. Hearing the confession of a penitent who would not willingly wait. 4. To do or note down something which, if one does not do or make a note of, is a cause of distraction or solicitude, so that this do not occur frequently—for frequent interruptions for such a cause would not stop short of irreverence. 5. Although there may without sin be interpolated some brief

prayer or pious affection of the heart, yet such interruptions, by way of meditation, must not be of frequent occurrence or of long continuance, as if so, they would interfere with or destroy the idea of recitation or vocal prayer. Moreover, if any lengthened vocal prayer, not belonging to the office, be said, it would amount to venial sin, as adding notably to the Hour, and so transgressing the prescribed form.

And now, what is one to do who perceives he has made an error in saying office? Error may occur in three ways: 1. Either with regard to the office of a day before; or, 2. With regard to the office of a day after; or, 3. With regard to the office of the current day. 1. He who remembers that he has omitted the office of a day before, cannot transfer it to another day, even were it unoccupied, for the obligation of the office attaches to the determinate day, and when that day has passed away, the obligation cannot be fulfilled. The theory of the translation of offices applies only in cases of the occurrence of Sundays and Feasts of higher rank, and not to the case of omission. 2. He who perceives that he has to-day recited the office prescribed for to-morrow, is bound to repeat the recitation to-morrow, inasmuch as by his anticipated recitation he could not satisfy a precept that was not yet in binding existence. 3. He who, after he has made considerable progress in it, finds he has made an error in the office of the current day, if it has occurred without his intention or fault, is not bound to amend his error. As to the part recited by another recitation, it will be sufficient that he recite what remains of the office that is due, and not continue the error after he has detected it.

We have defined the Canonical Hours, we have noted their number and origin, we have spoken of their obligation, and of how that obligation is to be satisfied as to time, order, and form. It remains that we discuss the mode of reciting the Divine office. The Lateran Council, held under Innocent III., by which the then most ancient custom of reciting the Hours was confirmed, and obtained the force, authority, and weight of written law, indicated also the mode of their recitation: they were to be *celebrated studiously and devoutly*. The word *studiously* pertains to the function of the lips, and demands that the office be performed vocally, without syncope and abscission of words. The word *devoutly* pertains to the function of the heart, and demands that the recitation be made with due intention and attention.

Some say, and among them so great an authority as Suarez, that he who recites office ought to hear himself

speaking, for this, say they, is necessary in order to vocal prayer, but it is most probably sufficient that there be vocal pronunciation of the words, for that amounts to recitation; and recitation, and not the hearing of recitation, is what is prescribed. This may be had, although the words be not heard by their reciter, for in order to true recitation, or true vocal pronunciation of the words, it is sufficient that there be formed some sound of the words, although that sound be small and scarcely apparent to the senses. In fact, the hearing or not hearing of the words does not pertain to the substance, but is an accident of their recitation.

One may say office along with a companion, and he need not necessarily be under obligation to say the Hours, but may even be a layman. In this case one satisfies his obligation who hears read by his companion the Lessons, Responses, Little Chapters, Prayers and Antiphons, and who says the Psalms either wholly by himself or alternately with his companion. The reason of this being sufficient to satisfy his obligation is that he who recites office with a companion is by that very companionship, and by application of his intention, held morally to communicate with him in prayer, since he intends to offer to God all the praises and all the prayers which his companion offers.

If, in their recitation, the reciter mutilates words or syllables, and the mutilation be so great as notably to destroy the sense of the words, he who does so voluntarily cannot be excused from mortal sin, and must repeat the part of which the sense has been corrupted. But if the mutilation has been made involuntarily,—as, for instance, if it has arisen from stammering or inveterate habit, and he who makes it is striving to amend the defect or habit,—he is not bound to do more.

Those persons do not satisfy their obligation who, in alternate recitation with a companion, do not wait for one verse to be ended before another is begun, for they thereby destroy the succession of parts. This caution, says an eminent theologian is most necessary and noteworthy; for how many are there not who hurry over with heedless precipitation so illustrious a function as that of prayer, and so call down on themselves, not the blessing but the curse of God?

We come now to consider what we have already indicated as necessary, the intention and the attention which are required in the recitation of the Divine Office.

The recitation of the Hours is a true prayer, that is, an elevation of the mind to God, and this cannot be made without

due intention and attention. What do these two words severally mean? *Intention* is a volition or intention of the will to do a certain thing. *Attention* is the application of the mind to that which is being done. It is necessary, therefore, that in the recitation of the Hours there be, 1, Intention, or at least, a general volition or intention of the will to pray. And so he who recites merely for the sake of learning, or exercising himself in reading, or committing the Psalms to memory, does not satisfy his obligation, but is bound to repeat the office, for such recitation is not prayer. 2. There must be attention, or application of the soul to the office which is being recited, otherwise the recitation would be material only and not spiritual also, and would consequently not be the act of the whole man, who is both material and spiritual, consisting, as he does, both of body and soul. But, it will be asked, what kind of intention and of attention is necessary? Intention is of two kinds; it may be either expressed or implicit. It is expressed when one says, I will to pray. It is implicit, when one does not actually say anything, but virtually intends it, as when one intends to recite the Canonical Hours in accordance with the precept of the Church. And intention of this kind is sufficient.

Attention is also of two kinds: it may be either external or internal. External attention is that which excludes every external action physically incompatible with that which is being performed. Internal attention is that which consists in an internal advertence of the mind to that which is being enacted. External attention is certainly required in order to the validity of the office, for without it there cannot be recitation. Among actions which are incompatible with internal attention are talking, writing, laughing, lending an attentive ear to what others are saying, doing something else with considerable application of the mind, and the like. He who does so may be said to ridicule God rather than to pray to Him. It is otherwise if, while one recites his office, he walks, washes himself, gathers flowers, stirs the fire, or the like, or recites while others are talking or singing, if he does not seriously apply his mind to what they are doing, for all these actions are sufficiently compatible with the act of recitation. In these matters, however, there cannot be formed or imposed one wooden rule, for some actions which are distractive in the case of one person are not distractive in the case of another.

But besides this external attention there must also be internal attention, and for this reason. In order to say office

at all, there is required, as we have seen, at least an intention of worshipping or praying to God, and this intention cannot be had without a degree of internal attention, since it is of the very nature and definition of prayer that it is an elevation of the mind to God. For surely, if one says his office with a mind alienated from God, it is not prayer, but a pretence of prayer, and a species of hypocrisy; and to him the words apply, "Ye hypocrites, well hath Isaiah prophesied of you, saying, This people honoureth Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me." The Trent fathers directed the [illegible] to be said "*reverently, distinctly,* and *devoutly*—reverently, with intention; distinctly, with external attention; devoutly, with internal attention.

But further, what internal attention is requisite? Besides the division of attention into *actual,* that which is; *virtual,* that which was, and remains in a manner; *habitual,* that which also was, but remains in no effect; and *interpretative,* that which might be: internal attention is capable of a threefold distinction. One is *spiritual,* or mystical; that, namely, which is directed towards God Himself, to wit, when the mind is elevated or raised towards Him by meditating, for instance, on His attributes, or on the Mysteries of the Passion of Christ. Another is *literal,* that, namely which is directed towards the sense, and in order to perceive and realize the meaning of the words. While a third is *superficial,* that, namely, which is directed towards the words alone, and solely in order to their proper pronunciation, and to the avoidance of error either by mutilation or misplacement. Adopting and keeping in view these distinctions, we may say that—1. Habitual attention is not sufficient nor yet interpretative, that actual intention is the best, but is not necessary, since it is not always within our own power, and there are opposed to it even involuntary distractions. What is sufficient and what is required is, to say the least, *virtual* attention, to which are opposed *voluntary* distractions only. 2. Spiritual attention, as we have explained it, is not required. It is, indeed, most excellent, and therefore praiseworthy and desirable, but it is not necessary, since it cannot easily be had. Neither is literal attention necessary, for otherwise the illiterate would not pray. What is sufficient and what is required, is, to say the least, superficial attention, that is, attention to the words; not, indeed, a complete and undivided attention to every individual word, but a moral and general attention combined with a pious intention of praying to and worshipping God. This attention, we say, is required, and it is sufficient. *It is*

required, inasmuch as the Divine Office is vocal prayer, and therefore to be accomplished by a distinct pronunciation of the words: and *it is sufficient,* for prayer so made is true prayer.

We have spoken of distractions in saying office. Let us speak of their remedies. These remedies may be either negative or positive, or both. A negative remedy is the subtraction of those things which cause the distractions,—as, for instance, preventing the eyes from wandering, withdrawing from the noise of tongues, or the like. A positive remedy is the procuring of those things which themselves create the attention,—as, for instance, eliciting at the beginning an intention of praising God, renewing this intention at the end of the Psalms, recollecting the presence of God, recalling the mysteries represented severally by the Seven Hours, keeping the eyes fixed on the words, for the better the eyes are bridled the more easily is the mind bridled or restrained from roaming, considering how great a function we are engaged in performing, for we are speaking not to man but to God, realizing on the one hand that there is standing by our side as we recite, that good and guardian angel who takes note of our merits, and on the other, that foul, malicious, envious, soul-destroying demon, who writes down in a book of remembrance every evil thought, and word, and deed.

He who says office while in mortal sin satisfies his obligation, and does not add another mortal sin; for, in the first place he does not therein exercise an act of Holy Order, and in the second, although he thereby merits nothing *de condigno,* yet he obtains good for others as praying in the name of the Church, which supplies his defects.

Some say that it is venial sin for one to say his office in an unmeet place, without cause, as involving irreverence. Others see no sin in this, inasmuch as God is everywhere, and therefore may everywhere be praised, as S. Paul said to Timothy, "I will that men pray *everywhere.*"

Per se, office may be said reverently in a carriage or on horseback, and this is the general custom even of the pious.

As to the question of the rubrics, and their observance, those who say their office in choir sin if without cause they transgress or neglect their directions, but not if they say it out of choir, because the rubrics have regard only to recitation in choir. It is well to observe them, however, in order to the furtherance of devotion.

The last question which occurs in connection with our subject is, What and how many are the causes which excuse

the non-recitation of the Divine Office by those who are under obligation to say it?

They are generally reckoned as six in number, to wit, 1. Loss of book, without the loser's fault; 2. Great fear; 3. Blindness; 4. Grievous infirmity; 5. Weighty occupation; and 6. Dispensation. These six, moreover, may be reduced under three heads: 1, impotence, physical or moral; 2, charity; and 3, dispensation.

1. We have said that loss of book is an excuse, but only if *without the loser's fault*, for if one throw his book into the fire or into the water, he sins, and is bound to retract that perverse will, at the same time to take care to procure another book, and meanwhile to recite what he remembers.

2. We have noted also great fear as an excuse. He is excused by great fear from saying office, either in whole or in part who dreads the occurrence thereby of some great detriment to either body or fame: as, for instance, if he anticipated grievous persecution from the heretics or infidels among whom his lot is cast. We have said *in whole or in part*, for when the matter of the precept is divisible, he who cannot fulfil the whole is bound to fulfil the part he can, on the same principle that a debtor who cannot pay the full amount of his debt is bound to pay as much as he is able.

3. Blindness is an excuse, inasmuch as it is a true physical impotence: and this includes any grievous disease of the eyes. If the blind man remembers any notable part of the office, he will recite that part, but he is not bound to commit it to memory for that purpose.

4. Under the cause of grievous infirmity are excused from saying office not only those who are actually labouring under grievous disease, but those also who cannot perform that function without grave peril of the same. One is excused, for instance, who is certain that the recitation will bring on serious headache or indigestion, or loss of strength.

5. Weighty occupation is then only an excuse when it cannot be prevented, and cannot be omitted without grave scandal, or grievous loss to oneself or others, and when it is incompatible with saying office. When these concur, there arises a moral impotence, and therefore a cessation of the obligation. Among those who are so excused are parish priests who are occupied the entire day in ministering not to the whole but to the sick, since such ministrations cannot be deferred, and necessity has no law. Confessors also who are occupied the entire day in hearing confessions which cannot be deferred, as, for instance, before Easter Communion.

Preachers, likewise, who cannot omit preaching without scandal. But not those who simply give themselves to literary study.

He who foresees an occupation inconsistent with recitation is bound to anticipate his usual time of saying office, but only if the obligation is already begun, for no one is bound to anticipate the fulfilment of a precept which does not yet exist. For instance, he who knows his occupations will prevent him saying the Matins of to-morrow is by no means bound to say them to-day, because their obligation has not yet begun.

6. As to Dispensation, the law of the Latin Communion is that the Supreme Pontiff can absolutely and even without cause validly dispense, and that even in the case of a beneficiary, inasmuch as the obligation to say office is not of the natural law, but only of positive ecclesiastical precept. According to the universally received custom in that communion a bishop cannot dispense save with cause, and for a short time.

We have given a brief sketch of the general teaching of the Latin portion of the Western part of the Church of God with regard to this act of the Divine Service. And go where you will you will see Latin precept carried out in consistent Latin practice. And what a subtle influence, what a tremendous power must they not have with God, those three or four hundred thousand priests who present themselves day by day, and seven times a day, before the Marriage Throne of the Heavenly Bridegroom in the Name of the Immaculate Spouse, to ask Him, in the way He wills, the favours He has promised, and of which He knows the children of that cherished Spouse have need. And when we think that every hour of the day, and every hour of the night, there are thousands of priests occupying themselves in this mighty function, that the East is praying while the West is reposing, so that the voice of prayer never ceases, do we not realise to ourselves the Oneness of the Church on earth with that City of the Living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem, where holy angels and blessed saints unite to worship His Adorable Name, ever, world without end? What a flood of benediction must not that many-voiced and mighty supplication bring down upon the earth! All ages, all countries, all tongues chant with us when we chant the Psalms of David. These immortal songs are sung at Rome, at Jerusalem, at Pekin, in Mexico, at S. Petersburg, at Cairo, at Constantinople, at Paris, and at London. The Temple of Solomon, the plains of Babylon and of Memphis, the banks of Jordan, the deserts of the Thebaid, the Catacombs of

Rome, the Basilicas of Nicæa, of Corinth, and of Antioch, have heard them. Through how many lips have they not passed! Tobias, on his bed of sorrows, Judith in the camp of Holofernes, Esther at the Court of Ahasuerus, Judas Maccabæus at the head of the warriors of Israel, have one and all recited them. Anthony has said them in the desert, Chrysostom at Antioch, Athanasius at Alexandria, Augustine at Hippo, Gregory at Nazianzum, Bernard at Clairvaux, and Xavier in Japan. And after so many ages, after having given expression to so many diverse desires, these immortal songs are as fresh and new as on the day when for the first time David sung them to the strains of his fiend-compelling harp. Do these glorious thoughts speak nothing to our hearts, do they impart no grandeur to our ideas, and enthusiasm to our resolves? Do they not, in a word, make us comprehend all the magic of the name of Catholic?

Yes! and they do one thing more, they cause a sickening of the soul to think how small a share the Church of England has had in that glorious and tremendous mediation between earth and heaven.

True she commands all priests and deacons within her pale to say daily the offices she appoints; true, also, that in her cathedrals and colleges her injunction has been heard and acted on; but what of the twenty thousand parish priests that either cultivate or cumber her fair domain? Here and there you find a faithful priest, mindful of his duties, saying his office privately or openly, as his circumstances determine: but the voices of all such priests in the English Communion are to the voices of the priests of Latin Christendom but as the babbling of a mountain stream to the noise of the waters of a mighty sea.

But the fact is, this practical failure on the part of English ecclesiastics to satisfy their obligations in respect of the Divine Office is like the cessation of the Daily Sacrifice, not so much a disease as the symptom of a disease. The evil lies deeper still. It is the failure on their part to realise the nature of the sacerdotal character, and therefore the obligations which its possession entails. In the beginning of the present century the English clergy were scarcely conscious of the principle of sacerdotalism. They led tolerably moral lives, like English country gentlemen, six days in the week, and on Sunday gave the theory of their practice in a moral essay, decorously prefaced by Matins, Litany, and Table Prayers. Holy Communion, administered at lengthened intervals, was a spiritual luxury for the more devout. At

last came that wave of sacerdotalism which has rolled over the religious mind and sentiment of England, both clerical and lay. English priests began to realise that their name of priests was not simply a name and nothing more, but that they were really and in truth the ministers of Jesus Christ. As such, they were not only free, but bound to exercise that power which He as man possessed and made over to the men whom He had chosen, and called, and sent to represent Him on the earth all days, even till He came again. He was a Prophet, or a man that taught, so were they. He was a Priest, or a man that offered sacrifice—so were they. He was a King, or a man that ruled—so were they. *Medii* between God and the people, as the vicars and vicegerents of the One Mediator between God and man, The Man, they had duties to both.

First came, but not all at once, the intellectual conviction of these duties, and it was in time followed, but not followed immediately, by their moral acceptance and practical performance. The duty to be first recognised and fulfilled was that towards man. The clergy had been lazy and apathetic; they now became active and energetic; but at first their activity and energy took no higher form than that of natural benevolence. The parish priest satisfied his conscience, if not his obligations, by his performance of the duties of the schoolmaster, the district visitor, and the relieving officer.

The Churches had been desecrated by years of neglect, and were closed from Sunday to Sunday. They were now cleansed, adorned, and thrown open, but with no higher idea than that of affording to a few pious and devout souls the spiritual luxuries of daily common prayer, and more frequent communion than heretofore. The Sacerdotal Idea in its fulness, and especially that side of it which looks towards the worship of God alone, had not yet developed itself in the English mind. But the idea was by no means either dead or dormant. It received further developments in the revival of confession, always advised and urged by the Church of England, but practically a dead letter in the religion of her children: and in dogmatic teaching, not of views or opinions, but of the faith of Jesus Christ and Him crucified. In other words, the ecclesiastics of England resumed their places in the pulpit and in the confessional and exercised the functions appropriate to each, of Prophets and of Kings in Christ, the One Teacher and Sole Monarch. Teaching their disciples, they themselves got deeper and fuller and truer visions of the truth as it is in Jesus. Ruling their penitents, they were led to govern themselves. They got the grace first to realise their obligations

towards God, and then to perform them. They began to see at length that it was as much their duty to offer to God continually the highest worship as to place within the reach of man his highest privilege; or, in other words, that it was incumbent upon them to offer to God all days the Divine and adorable Sacrifice of the Altar, irrespective of the worshippers who might or might not avail themselves of the unspeakable privilege of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.

Then and not till then was it that the Divine Office received its due place in their estimation and at their hands. And there was a fitness in this order of progress and development. It was but meet and right that they should realize and satisfy their obligations in respect of that action which Jesus Christ Himself instituted, and in His Holy Gospel commanded us to continue, as our bounden duty, and as the Divine Service, the perpetual memory of His precious Death until His coming again, before they realized and satisfied their less stringent obligations in respect of that other service which is not of Divine, but only of positive and ecclesiastical precept.

In order to have clear ideas as to the two services, their mutual relations and relative obligations, let us briefly consider their theory and history.

Man has been permitted by his Maker to worship Him by two methods—by acts, and by words. Up to the first Maundy Thursday, the two methods were wholly distinct, for both before and under the law, no authorized form of words accompanied the act of sacrifice. That act of worship was the first in order of time, and always was, is now, and always will be, the highest and most gratifying to Almighty God. Gradually, and side by side with, but distinct from the worship of sacrafice or service of act, there grew up a service of words. This was the fruit, not of Divine and general legislation, but of individual inspiration, as in the cases of Miriam, of Moses, and of David. The sacrifice, or service of act, could be performed only in the Tabernacle or the Temple. The service of words might be offered anywhere, at any time, and by any body, as in the case of Saul in the School of the Prophets; he went into choir and took his part in the office that was being said, or prophesied, as it was technically called. The Incarnation effected a change on this, as on all things else. The Eternal Word having assumed the material of the One Sacrifice, words did, on and after the first Maundy Thursday, fitly make part of the act of sacrifice, as well as continue a service by themselves. Jesus Christ approved both services, the Divinely instituted, of act, and the Divinely approved,

of words, by being present at both, at the one in the Temple, at the other in the Synagogues. The Apostles also were accustomed to both, and after Pentecost said Office in Solomon's Porch, as they said Mass in the Upper Room where was the first Christian Altar. They did not invent a new office, but used what lay ready to their hand, the Jewish Office with which they were familiar, and which, so far as it went, could not be surpassed. To this they gradually added Christian elements. It was mainly composed of the Psalms, the divinely-appointed staple matter of all offices, with Invitatory, Lessons, Versicles, and Responses; but the Jews knew nothing of *Gloria Patri*—that was added by S. Ambrose. It throws the light of eternal truth on and through the Psalms, and is an act of reparation for irreverence and irrecollection during their recitation. They knew nothing of "I believe in Jesus Christ," and yet the Psalms are full of Him, and the sound of His sweet Name supplies alike the key-note to their melody and the clue to their interpretation. These are privileges which are ours, and they bring with them, one and all, their own responsibilities.

The restorations in the Church of England which are going on in our day can have but one ultimate result, her re-union with the other portions of Christendom. It only remains for us to determine whether collectively and individually we will contribute our share towards that magnificent triumph of the God of Peace and Love, of Unity and Concord, by realizing our responsibilities and satisfying our obligations as English ecclesiastics, in a word, "by doing our duty in that state of life to which it has pleased God to call us."

Art. VII.—CARDINAL XIMENES. In Two Parts.

Part II.

It would be long to recount Ximenes' good deeds as Archbishop of Toledo. If his revenues were immense, he had not sought them, and he dispensed them in works of mercy. He visited the hospitals, pensioned distressed widows, fed thirty poor persons daily at his palace, founded four hospitals, eight monasteries, and raised twelve churches. But we must now follow him to the councils of state, and leave to his Spanish eulogists the details of his pious labours in the humble walk of diocesan activity.

On the death of Isabella the court of Castile was thrown into great confusion and trouble. The crown of that kingdom devolved on her daughter Joanna, whose settled melancholy degenerated into madness. Her husband Philip, on whom she doated, neglected her cruelly, and strove, in opposition to Isabella's testament, to exercise regal power and exclude Ferdinand, his father-in-law, from that regency which the deceased queen had bequeathed to him. A struggle ensued, in which Ximenes leaned constantly to the side of Ferdinand and the terms of Isabella's will; but the contest was soon amicably adjusted, and every occasion of further dispute was removed by the death of Philip in 1506, the choice of a Council of State with Ximenes at its head by the Castilian nobles, and the ultimate acceptance of the Regency in a formal manner by Ferdinand, King of Aragon. The provisional government of Castile ceased, and Ximenes with two colleagues was fully empowered to conduct affairs. The unfortunate Joanna continued insane, and Charles her son, subsequently Charles V., was still a minor.* During a most critical period the Archbishop had given full proof of his talents as an administrator by the admirable *finesse* with which he had mediated between the Castilians and the King. Joanna herself, desolate and deranged, was unable to appreciate his services, and rebuked him as a meddler. It was long before she could be removed from the corpse of her faithless husband, and she would sit nearly the whole day in a dark room in silence, and, with her chin resting on her right hand, feed rather than allay her melancholy with the soft tones of Flemish music.

* Robertson's *Hist. of Charles V.* Book i. p. 121.

Three months after Philip's death she caused his body to be disinterred at Miraflorés, and in spite of all the remonstrances of her attendants, ordered it to be conveyed before her to the town of Torquemada. She travelled with it at night only and by the light of torches, saying that darkness suited best the gloom of her widowhood. Thus strangely attended she met her father, Ferdinand, when he came with great pomp to take the reins of government into his own hands. Ximenes was with her when, wild and haggard, Ferdinand embraced her at Tortolés. The Archbishop had gradually united all parties, and had won over to the King's side most of his bitterest opponents. It was therefore natural that the master should highly reward so useful a servant. He asked of Pope Julius II., and readily obtained for Ximenes, the dignity of Cardinal of the Roman Church, and to this he added himself that of Grand Inquisitor of Castile and Leon. The importance and bearing of this function will be apparent from the following remarks.

It is in Spain that the terrible tribunal of the Inquisition has obtained greater power and influence than in any other country. It there found something in the national character unhappily congenial to its character, and though it was employed as a political engine,* though the Popes made repeated efforts to restrain its cruelties,† it is nevertheless certain that ecclesiastics presided over its tribunals, and that the principle on which it acted has been, times without number, approved by the Roman See. That principle appears to be that in a Catholic country the temporal arm ought to be directed by ecclesiastical authority for the extirpation of heresy and the punishment of obstinate offenders against the established Church. But experience has proved that however this principle may be defended in the abstract, it is, when applied to practice, cruel and barbarous, fosters hypocrisy, multiplies spies, and produces fierce reprisals. It corrupts the national character, and vitiates the religion which it is intended to preserve intact. It is more injurious to its authors than to those against whom it is directed. It has been well called "treason against the majesty of truth." We have lived to see its extinction, and we devoutly trust that it may never be revived. The pictures drawn of the cruelties of the Spanish Inquisition by Llorente may be too highly

* Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes*, vol. i. p. 245, *et seq.* De Maistre *sur l'Inquisition, passim.*

† Newman, *Position of Catholics*, p. 202.

coloured, or the apologies offered by Balmez* and Von Hefele may be too favourable to the tribunal, but in any case its general features are the same—at variance with the spirit of our age and hateful beyond other forms of tyranny because established in the name of religion. No better summary of its functions can be found than in the decisions of the Council of Toulouse in 1229.† In these we see as in a glass the outline of all subsequent Inquisitions. The tribunal established by Ferdinand and Isabella was especially directed toward the extirpation of Judaism. Disguised and relapsed converts, whether Jews or Moors, were particularly obnoxious to it, and the number of persons who suffered imprisonment and death under these charges is a subject of endless discussion. Torquemada was made Inquisitor-General with the approval of Sixtus IV., and one of the earliest decrees of importance to which the new organisation gave rise was the banishment of all Jews who refused to be baptised. How many hundred thousand were thus driven over the wide world we shall never know, but we do know that they were forbidden to take with them any precious metal, and that vast numbers of them perished by pestilence in Italy, or were plundered and murdered in Africa by the Moors. The Holy Office, with its council and forty-five Inquisitors, wielded its formidable power at a time when society was notoriously depraved and neither the bishops nor the inferior clergy were fitting censors of the faith and morals of others.‡ Slavish and ignorant minds only were safe under such rulers, and authors of every description were compelled to submit to their sentences. The benefits resulting from free discussion and inquiry were lost, and faith, which might have been intelligent, groped bigoted and blind. Political aims were coupled with religious in the proceedings of the Inquisition; Deza, Torquemada's successor, introduced it into Granada, and was the chief instrument in the severe measures adopted against the Moors. The State was losing its freedom, and monarchy, throwing off its constitutional restraints, was becoming absolute, and employed the Inquisition as an engine for breaking the power of the nobles and the clergy. This fact rendered it popular, and enlisted the people on the royal side in the contest for supreme power which was carried on in silence. To the political character of the Spanish Inquisition many writers testify, and among them I may mention, besides Ranke and Guizot, Henry Leo, Have-

* *Protestantism and Catholicity compared*, ch. 36.
† Haurdin, tom. vii. Von Hefele, p. 285.
‡ Von Hefele, pp. 199, 200, &c.

mann, Lenormant, and Spittler. It could not at that time be otherwise than a state engine, for heresy was then high-treason.* It was a civil offence no less than a religious one. The laws were then sanguinary, and the punishments inflicted by the Inquisition could not be mild. All Christian communions persecuted. Witches and sorcerers were tied to the stake. Cruelty was the order of the day; and a long succession of Popes, from Sixtus IV. to Innocent XII., endeavoured during two centuries to mitigate the severity of the Spanish tribunals, though they did not, as I have already stated, and perhaps could not, disown the principle on which they stood. Many of their provisions leaned to the side of mercy, and if Ximenes succeeded Deza as Grand-Inquisitor, he did so in perfect accordance with the spirit of his age and the opinions prevalent in the Church. If he confirmed the Inquisitorial power in Spain, and extended it to Oran in Africa, to America and the Canary Islands, he acted thus from the conviction that its design was good and that its means were lawful. He must be judged by the maxims not of the nineteenth, but of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. He resisted the severity of his predecessor when it reached extravagant limits, and he used every expedient for diminishing the number of cases reserved for the Inquisitorial courts. The connection which he had with the Tribunal redounded to his honour, so far as that was possible, and Llorente himself may be cited on many points as a witness in his favour. Of all the blood that was shed under his administration it is probable that his conscience was not stained by a single drop. But I am far from vindicating the Inquisition on this score. Von Hefele has said all that can be adduced in its defence, yet he concludes by assuring us that he is "from the bottom of his heart *averse to every religious oppression on the part of the temporal power*, no matter whether perpetrated by a Torquemada in the cowl of a Dominican, or by a minister of the nineteenth century in his court dress."†

Ximenes had a twofold purpose in advising Ferdinand to achieve the conquest of Oran. He knew how important such a possession would be to his country in a commercial and stragetic point of view, and he longed to see the Cross replanted on the Afric shores. He had conceived a vaster plan, and, like the long line of Pontiffs from Sylvester II. to Clement XII.,‡ had negotiated with courts and princes

* See Prescott's *Philip II.* Book iii. ch. 3.
† p. 380.
‡ Newman on the Turks, p. 182.

with a view to recovering the holy sepulchre. But this fair project had fallen to the ground, and the opulent territory of Oran, being near at hand, offered a better chance of success. His courage and resolution rose with difficulties, and though he was in his 72nd year, though the town of Oran was strongly fortified, though its cruisers in immense numbers swept the seas, he determined to march in person to its conquest, and supply out of his own coffers all the necessary expenses. Some laughed at the Franciscan father being suddenly placed at the head of a martial enterprise, and thought he had better stay at home and tell his beads. But Ferdinand felt otherwise. He was convinced of the prelate's military talents, and gave him full proof of his unbounded confidence. All the forces were put at his disposal, and he might choose whatever Spanish port he pleased for the fleet's equipment. Blank papers were given him signed by the King, and he was allowed to fill them up when orders were to be carried out by royal authority. Thus every means of propagating the faith according to the received opinions of the time were placed in his hands without stint.* At home he wielded the arms of the Inquisition, backed by a noble University, the Polyglot, and a princely revenue, while abroad he was permitted to plant the standard of the Cross on the turrets of the Moors by the help of legions trained to warfare under "the great Captain" Gonsalvo de Cordova. To him Ximenes would gladly have committed the command of the forces, but as the King was not on good terms with Gonsalvo, he chose rather Count Pedro Navarro. Fourteen thousand men were soon under arms, contributions poured in from all sides, Churchmen of high degree offered to buckle on their armour, and in 1509, after many delays and intrigues, Ximenes, triumphant as usual over obstacles and adversaries, collected twenty-four prefects and governors of towns and cities, placed them each at the head of a division, and then with two of his chaplains joined the army himself, and arrived at Carthagena. Treachery among his officers and mutiny among his men were the next trials of his patience and fortitude. The soldiers demanded their pay in advance, but Ximenes complied only in part with this unreasonable request. He harangued the seditious with effect, and at last, on the 16th of May, set sail with ten galleys, eighty large transports, and many vessels of inferior size.†

* See Mariana, *Hist. de Espana*, lib. 28-9.
† Gomez, lib. iv.

Though the Cardinal was weak and emaciated, his mind had lost none of its vigour. As an incentive to Navarro, he reminded him before all the officers that the glory of the expedition, if successful, would rest upon him as "commander-in-chief." The powers of the two chieftains were ill defined, and gave rise to much jealousy on Navarro's part. It was obviously inconsistent to subordinate a military captain to an ecclesiastic, and accordingly after the victory we find the King addressing Navarro directly instead of Ximenes. Nothing in history is more anomalous than their relation to each other, and it is marvellous that men so unevenly yoked together proved victorious. The army landed, and was drawn up in order of battle. Ximenes appeared at its head. He was mounted on a mule in his pontifical robes, and a sword hung at his belt. Priests and monks armed with scimitars formed his body-guard, and a Franciscan friar of huge stature bore a standard before him emblazoned with the crucifix on one side and the arms of the house of Cisneros on the other.* The calvacade sang the hymn *Vexilla Regis prodeunt*, and the Cardinal, riding along the ranks and imposing silence, addressed the soldiers in a strain of fervid eloquence. "The piracies of the Moors," he said, "called aloud for punishment, and the voice of Spanish maidens and matrons whom they had dishonoured and enslaved arose to heaven as a witness against them. The war was not one of aggression but of self-defence, and he desired nothing better than to stand, as he intended to stand, among the foremost exposed to danger." From this resolution, however, both men and officers dissuaded him, and he retired into the fortress of Mazarquiver, and there, like Aaron with uplifted hands, besought the God of Battles with many tears (as Gomez relates) that victory might be granted to the Christians. But for him, and that confidence which he derived from prayer, the battle had been lost.† But for his orders Navarro would have prevented the cavalry from taking part in the engagement because the country was hilly, and would have delayed the attack till the next day, when the chief visir of Tremesen arrived with strong reinforcements. It was Ximenes, too, who ordered that the defiles of the sierras round Oran should be occupied, so as to secure the main body of the army from sudden attack. The day was far advanced when the trumpets sounded for battle. The fleet opened a heavy fire on

* Robles, *Vida de Ximenes.*
† Quintanilla, *Architypo* (Palermo, 1633.)

the city, while the troops forced their way up the heights, fighting hand to hand with Moors who disputed their advance with fierce obstinacy. At length one Lousa, a captain of the Cardinal's guard, planted his master's standard on the towers, shouting with a loud voice, "*Santiago y Ximenes!*" The enemy fled in confused masses, and the Spanish cavalry completed the victory with the most horrible carnage, sparing neither sex nor age. In vain Navarro strove to call off the men, they yielded only to the seduction of wine, and at last, weary of butchery, sank to sleep amid the corpses of those whom they had slain. The license in which they indulged was worthy of the Infidels they conquered—so little effect had Ximenes' blessing in taming the ferocity of their passions. On the morrow the Cardinal entered Oran in triumph. The glory of the exploit was ascribed to him alone, but he exclaimed amid the deafening shouts of the troops, "*Non nobis, Domine, sed Nomini Tuo gloria.*" Some affirmed that he was inspired, others that the daylight had been prolonged in answer to his prayers, as when Joshua strove with the Amorites. Others, again, suspected treachery, and Gomez tells us that the Cardinal had bought over some of the inhabitants of Oran, who acted as spies and gave him secret intelligence.* The "credulous" Quintanilla † attests the miracle, but it need be referred to only as a feature of the times. The great wonder was that so strong a place should have been so quickly taken. 4,000 Moors had fallen ‡; from 5,000 to 8,000 were made prisoners. The Spaniards maintained, very improbably, that they lost only thirty men. Half a million of gold ducats fell into the Cardinal's hands, and after reserving part of the treasure for the King he distributed the rest among the soldiers. Provisions in abundance and 60 pieces of cannon were a portion of the booty. The keys of the fortress were laid at Ximenes' feet, and he had the satisfaction of setting at liberty 300 Christian captives. He established at Oran likewise a tribunal of the Inquisition, lest many "converted" Spanish Jews should hasten thither to renounce a religion in which they did not believe.

At Tremesen the natural consequences of propagating Christianity by the sword showed themselves. The inhabitants there fell upon the Jews and Christian merchants, and indiscriminately slew them all. Reprisals called for reprisals; and in the following year Tremesen, Algiers, and

* See *Revue des Deux Mondes, Mai*, 1841.
† Von Hefele, Preface by Dalton, p. xiii.
‡ Inscription on a tablet in the Cathedral of Toledo.

Tunis were taken by Navarro; Bugia also, and Tripoli, after desperate resistance, yielded to the Spanish arms. Opulent marts on the Barbary coasts were secured, and the Mediterranean was cleared of pestilent marauders. The power and wealth of Spain was for a time immensely increased, but Ferdinand's successors were too feeble or too indolent to hold fast his conquests.

As for Ximenes, he found in the midst of triumph much to vex his spirit. Navarro treated him alternately with submissiveness and insult. The Cardinal had reason to believe that the king was jealous of his greatness, and a letter addressed by Ferdinand to Navarro fell into his hands, in which the former desired his General to retain Ximenes in Africa as long as needful. This naturally induced the Cardinal to return. A fortnight after the battle he set sail from Oran, and in Spain was received everywhere as a conquerer and hero. At Alcalá a breach was made in the walls by which he might enter, and camels laden with booty were led before him by a troop of Moorish slaves. Banners torn from the vanquished, chandeliers from the Mosques, Arabic manuscripts on medicine and astrology, and the massive keys of gates and citadels, gave lustre to his ovation, and were desposited with joyous solemnity in a chapel of the holy Virgin. Rome itself joined in the thanksgiving, and Julius II. in a consistory passed high eulogiums on Ximenes and his African expedition. Long after his death he was supposed to watch over the fortunes of Oran, and on several occasions he was seen by some dreaming sentinels stalking on the battlements by moonlight, or riding at the head of an aërial army mounted on a mule with a Cardinal's hat and a General's baton in his hand. Those who are curious about such legends, may find them with full particulars in Fléchier's *Histoire de Ximénes*, but I hope there is no impiety in treating them as old wives' tales.* Neither in the New World nor the Old were Spanish conquests so righteous and beneficial as to call for miraculous interferences.

The expedition to Oran was but an episode in Ximenes' life. His chief work was in his diocese, and his labours there knew no respite. Among these good deeds may be mentioned that of erecting and endowing a beautiful chapel in his cathedral, where the Mozarabic mass and office is celebrated to this day.† It is a common mistake, even among Roman

* See Von Hefele, p. 430.
† Canon Dalton's Preface to Von Hefele.

Catholics, to suppose that the mass in their communion is always said in Latin. A large number of Syrian and other Oriental bishops and priests in the Roman obedience do not know one word of Latin, and when they come to Europe they minister at the altar in their own dialects.

Neither Ximenes' age nor services sufficed to screen him from the enmity of grandees and the unkindness of Ferdinand. The King was unwilling to fulfil his contract to annex Oran to the Archbishopric of Toledo, or to refund the expenses of the war incurred by the Cardinal. When at last he consented to repay the money, he sent a commissioner to examine Ximenes' apartment, and to see what he had reserved from the spoils. The soldiers too, who had shared in the booty by his orders, were commanded to show what they had received, and to return whatever was thought to exceed their due proportion. At the same time he was urged to resign the Archbishopric of Toledo to Ferdinand's natural son—a worldly prelate, a politician, and a soldier. To this proposal Ximenes replied that he would never leave his spouse, nor exchange the See of Toledo for any other. He would rather return to the poverty and solitude which had never ceased to be dear to him. Nothing more, therefore, was said on the subject, and though Ferdinand continued to show a certain coolness towards him, it was exchanged for attention and honour whenever it suited his purpose. Thus in the winter of 1511 he summoned him to Seville to co-operate with him in behalf of Pope Julius II. against the King of France, and went out with his court several miles to meet him. On his journey, Ximenes, who was most scrupulous with regard to females, was very nearly entrapped into accepting the hospitality of a pious lady named Teresa Antiques, to whom he had once been confessor. She was most desirous to have him as her guest, and to profit by his advice and presence. She accordingly let it be understood that she was away from home, and the Cardinal, fancying the house free of so dangerous a tenant as a lady, accepted her invitation. But he had hardly been there a few hours when she returned and requested an interview. Angry at the *ruse*, Ximenes instantly left the house, and without even a show of politeness betook himself to a neighbouring Franciscan monastery. Whatever advantages of a higher order he may have secured by such perpetual avoidance of female society, he certainly lost that tenderness of character and sweetness of address which it alone can impart.

Great as were Ximenes' powers of mind, they never brought him into collision with the Holy See, except on two or three

questions of privilege. He opposed the reading in the diocese of the papal bull relative to the completion of St. Peter's Church in Rome, because, by the indulgences it offered, it relaxed, as he thought, unduly the temporal punishments imposed on sin.* He required one of his canons also to renounce a dispensation he had received from Rome; and he advised Ferdinand to enact a law for the inspection of all papal bulls by a minister of state before publication.† With such exceptions, Ximenes was always on the Pope's side. He warmly supported Leo X. in his project for reforming the Julian Calendar, and it was not his fault if the measure was delayed half a century.‡ He espoused the cause of Julius II. against the King of France, when that martial pontiff having first leagued with Louis XII. against Venice, afterwards leagued with Venice against Louis XII.§ and made friends of foes, or foes of friends, according as they protected or invaded the Papal States. When the victorious Louis defeated the Pontical army in Italy, and assembled at Pisa a council which declared him to be deposed, Ferdinand, Henry VIII., and the Emperor Maximilian were urged by Julius II. to take up arms in his defence, and Ximenes, as a dutiful prelate, hastened to assist his master with his counsels, declaring that "it would be folly to fight the enemies of the Christian religion in Africa, when the head of the Catholic Church was attacked in Rome."

Ferdinand's great qualities, which made his reign so brilliant, were derived in part from his union with Isabella. When she died, and he contracted an alliance with a young queen, far inferior in virtue and ability to his former consort, his strength declined and his selfishness and suspicions increased. By one testament he bequeathed the regency to the Infante Ferdinand during the absence of Charles, his heir, and then, through the remonstrances of his council, he reversed this ill-advised disposition. It would have made one brother rival of the other, and that one too young to wield the sceptre of a powerful kingdom. Accordingly, Ferdinand listened to his counsellors' entreaties, and with some reluctance and signs of displeasure consented to the appointment of Ximenes as the fittest person in the realm to govern until

* Gomez, lib. v.

† See Gomez and Von Hefele, p. 447.

‡ Von Hefele, in Canon Dalton's translation, p. 446, says the project of Leo X. was "realized *two centuries* later by Gregory XIII." A strange mistake. Leo X. died in 1521, Gregory XIII. in 1585.

§ *Manual of the Lives of the Popes*, p. 187. (Richardson, 1866.)

Charles should arrive and take possession of his own. Nothing was more natural in that rude age than that ecclesiastics should take a prominent part in the affairs of State. Society was built on a religious basis, and the Church dictated and controlled its laws. It is otherwise now. Religious toleration is accepted as a first principle, and many, probably, now living will see the last of spiritual and temporal government combined in one head.

The words used by Ferdinand in assenting to the choice of Ximenes as regent are worthy of note. "It is well," he said: "he is certainly a good man with honest intentions. He has no importunate friends or family to provide for. He owes everything to Queen Isabella and myself; and as he has always been true to the interests of our family, I believe he will always remain so."* On the 23rd of January, 1516, Ferdinand breathed his last, and a letter from the royal council announced to Ximenes the King's decease and his own nomination to the Regency. Stern and austere as he was usually, the news affected him, and he burst into tears. But the firmness of his character was unshaken. He resisted two competitors for the Regency—the Infante Ferdinand, whose appointment the King himself had set aside, and Dean Hadrian (afterwards Pope Hadrian VI.†), Charles's preceptor, who claimed it by virtue of an invalid document signed by the hereditary prince. Ximenes, however, took pains to conciliate the prelate. He proposed to share his power with him until Charles himself should decide which of the two should rule in his name. The result of this moderation was that the Cardinal became confirmed in his power, and he transferred the seat of government to Madrid, which subsequently rose to be the capital of the kingdom. The Castilians were extremely unwilling that Charles should be proclaimed King during the lifetime of his deranged mother Joanna, and Ximenes did his best to dissuade the Prince from insisting on this step. But though it could add nothing to his real power, Charles was resolved not to forego it, and the Cardinal, siding as he generally did with royal inclinations, took it on himself to order the proclamation to be made. His severity was too much feared to allow of any resistance, and all the towns in the kingdom followed the example of Madrid excepting those in Aragon, which refused compliance until Charles himself

* Carbajal (one of the King's council) quoted by Prescott.

† Hadrian is frequently spelt Adrian. The variation in the spelling of the names of Popes is endless. Ximenes too is now often written Jimenes. Dalton's Preface, p. xi. note.

arrived in Spain. There is a story related of the Cardinal, which is very characteristic, but which Gomez repeats merely as a tradition. It states that the Castilian aristocracy, impatient of the yoke of their priestly regent, went on one occasion in a body and demanded by what right he ruled so absolutely. Ximenes referred them to Ferdinand's will and Charles's letter; but as this did not satisfy them, he led them to a window, and, showing them a park of artillery, exclaimed, "There are my credentials!"* Stories such as these led Voltaire to speak of Ximenes as one "who, dressed in a friar's frock, proudly set his sandalled foot on the neck of Spanish pride."†

One of the first acts of his administration was to enrol the burgesses into companies of volunteers. 30,000 citizens made up his rifle corps. The measure was intended to protect the liberties of the people, and the nobles opposed it. Ximenes executed the plan vigorously, though he had decided on it without Charles's sanction, and in opposition to many of the council. He did not foresee that these train-bands would ultimately be turned against the very liberties he meant them to guard. For the time being they strengthened his hands with physical force, and he proceeded to enact financial reforms on an extensive scale. All waste in military expenditure was inquired into; all superfluous offices in the State were suppressed. He retrenched excessive salaries, and cut short many pensions which had been granted by Ferdinand and Isabella. Unfortunately, the State derived little advantage from this economy, owing to the cupidity of the Flemish court, which made no scruple of indulging in boundless luxury at the expense of Spain. Courage and vigour marked in no less degree the Regent's foreign administration. Arsenals were established, and a numerous fleet was equipped against the Barbary corsairs. In 1516, a large force sent into Navarre defeated the invading French, and the principal fortresses of the hostile kingdom were demolished. The utmost limits of the monarchy were the object of the prelate's care. He sent a commission into Hispaniola to ameliorate the condition of the natives, and he opposed to the utmost the advice given by Flemish counsellors to introduce negro slaves into the colony. He predicted a servile war as the consequence, and the event unhappily proved his foresight.

The determined manner in which Ximenes carried his

* Robertson, *Hist. of Charles V.*, book i. p. 182.
† *Essai sur les Mœurs*, chap. cxxi.

measures into effect offended the aristocracy, and gave umbrage to his associate, Hadrian, the Dean of Louvain. This prelate accordingly reported the state of matters to his Prince. A second, and then a third viceroy was sent to Castile, empowered to govern in concert with the Cardinal. But this availed little. On one occasion they sent despatches to their partner with their names subscribed that he might add his signature. Ximenes directed his secretary to tear the paper in pieces, made out a new one, signed it himself, and sent it off without any other name being affixed. This practice he continued during his administration, for he had no fear of man before his eyes.* "There can be no doubt," Peter Martyr wrote of him, "that he is great in spirit, but he delights in military display and a military style of address. He was not born to rule a state, but rather to rear noble institutions and foster literary minds."

In the most important public acts, Ximenes assumed the entire responsibility, and rarely troubled himself to take into account the obstacles that might be thrown in his way. Hence he was often brought into collision with the magnates of the land. Don Pedro Giron, with several other young noblemen, thought it would be a fine thing to beard the Regent in the person of his officers. Accordingly they took an early opportunity of resisting and ill-treating some of them in the discharge of their duty. The Count of Ureña espoused the cause of his son, and the Dukes of Alva and Infantado joined with him. They ensconced themselves within the town of Villafrata, and prepared for defence. The Cardinal forthwith mustered some thousands of the national militia, invested the place, fired it, and razed it to the ground.† The refractory nobles submitted, and their friends interceded for them humbly. Ximenes disdained trampling on a fallen foe, and obtained their pardon from the King.

Meanwhile, the shameless extortion of the Flemings, and the little interest shown for Spain by the new monarch, exasperated the people, and rendered the Cardinal's administration unpopular. The highest offices in Church and State were put up to sale, and the kingdom was drained of its wealth by remittances sent continually to Flanders. The people were made for the king, not the king for the people. He had a divine right to be extortionate: and his subjects were bound by divine laws to allow themselves to be fleeced. The sufferings of the many should contribute to the pleasures of the

* Prescott, *Ferdinand and Isabella*, vol. ii. p. 386.
† Sandoval, *Hist. del Emp. Carlos V.*, i. 73.

few. Such was the natural order of things, arising out of the first principles of human society. Very convenient doctrine, truly, for those who are in power; but Ximenes and the Council protested against it with all their might. Their remonstrances were private, and could not be made public without disrespect to their master. The Regent, therefore, shared the odium which attached to the Government generally; and Peter Martyr speaks in several of his letters with bitter and undeserved sarcasm of "*Bonus ille frater Ximenes Cardinalis,*"* and of his enriching Flanders at the expense of his own country. Great minds are always misunderstood. It is certain that the Regent did all in his power to induce Charles to follow the example of his illustrious grandparents. But the popular dissatisfaction increased, and a convocation of Cortes was loudly demanded. Ximenes avoided this as long as he could, both because the sovereign was absent, and because he was always distrustful of popular assemblies, particularly in moments of excitement. He earnestly desired the King's return; he was more than eighty years of age, tried by sickness and infirmities, thwarted by his superior, upbraided by the people, decried by the nobles, and wearied beyond measure with a burden his inflexible spirit scarcely enabled him to bear.

On the 17th of September, 1517, Charles landed in Spain. The Regent lay ill in a Franciscan monastery, but his depressed spirits revived at the good news, and he instantly despatched letters of congratulation and counsel to his royal master. The messages he received from the King in return were of the most gracious description, and expressed cordial wishes for his complete restoration to health.

The Flemings who attended Charles retarded his steps in the north as long as possible. They dreaded his meeting with Ximenes, lest the latter should gain an ascendancy over him. They had used the Regent as a tool to bridle the pride of the nobles; but they now poisoned the King's ear by exaggerated reports of his morose temper and arbitrary conduct. Charles was young, and experience had not yet taught him to suspect his advisers.

Persuaded by evil counsellors, he addressed a letter to Ximenes marked by the basest ingratitude. Thanking the Regent for his past services, it appointed a spot for a personal interview, where the King would obtain the benefit of his advice on various matters; after which he would be permitted

* Epist. 606.

to retire to his own diocese. He would there seek from heaven the rewards which heaven alone could adequately bestow. More than one writer affirms that this letter killed the Cardinal;* but his spirit was so stern, and so well schooled in opposition, that we may well doubt whether it really took such terrible effect. He was deeply affected, however, by so cruel a desertion on the part of a sovereign he had served so faithfully; and the excitement it produced brought on a return of the fever from which he had almost recovered. His once hardy constitution was thoroughly enfeebled; and his master's ungrateful act weaned him more than ever from a world to which, in any case, he must soon bid farewell. He had previously removed to Roa, in order to be near the King. He now turned his thoughts to the end he saw clearly approaching. Death has seldom any terrors for those to whom conscience has been the guide of life. Ximenes averred in his last moments "that he had never intentionally wronged any man; that he had rendered to every one his due, without being swayed by affection or fear." He attempted to write to the King; but his fingers refused to trace the lines, and he soon gave it up. He had intended to recommend his university at Alcalá to the royal patronage. He now gave himself entirely to devotion; and all present were deeply impressed by the contrition for his faults and humble confidence in the divine mercy which he manifested. The words he used to repeat frequently in health were the last he uttered—*In te, Domini, speravi.* Thus tranquil in mind, and in perfect possession of his faculties, he expired on the 8th of November, 1517. He was in the eighty-first year of his age, and the twenty-second since his being raised to the primacy.

Arrayed in pontifical robes, his body was seated in a chair of state, and multitudes of all ranks thronged to kiss the hands and feet. It was afterwards transported to Alcalá, and was laid in the chapel of the college of San Ildefonso, which he had erected. No spot more appropriate could have been chosen for his sepulture; but the inscription which is so felicitous in the case of Sir Christopher Wren, *Si monumentum requiris, circumspice,* would have been altogether inadequate in that of Ximenes. The memorials of his greatness lay far beyond the walls of Alcalá, on the coasts of Oran, in the the archives of state, the academies of learning, and the purified homes of monastic piety. Contrary to his instructions, his funeral was celebrated with great pomp by all the

* "This terrible letter was the cause of his death."—Marsollier, p. 447.

fraternities of the city, religious and literary. A doctor of University pronounced an oration on his virtues; and the lowing epitaph by the learned John Vergara was inscribed his tomb:—

> Condideram musis Franciscus grande lyceum;
> Condor in exiguo nunc ego sarcophago.
> Prætextam junxi saccho, galeamque galero,
> Frater, dux, præsul, cardineusque frater.
> Quin virtute meâ junctum est diadema cucullo,
> Cùm mihi regnanti paruit Hesperia.

Little can be said for the inscription. It is dry scholastic, without feeling, and almost without eulc Nevertheless, the facts to which it alludes indic one of the most remarkable of men. The genius wh enabled Ximenes to distinguish himself in so many branc was [of the highest order, and his moral qualities w no less marked and vigorous than those of his mind. was in the cabinet and the cloister what Dante was in realms of fancy, and Michael Angelo in the studio. pursued his ends by the boldest and most direct means, daining those soft and pliant arts on which ordinary spi rely. The difficulties which deterred other men had a ch for him, as dangerous passes and precipitous heights att the bold climber and call forth all the vigour and supplen of his limbs. His vocation to a religious life has never b doubted, yet nature had given him such a taste for war, tl according to his biographers Gomez and Robles, "the sn of gunpowder was more grateful to him than the sweet perfume of Arabia." But it was war with the unbeliever o which he found congenial—war with which, to his mind, glory of God and the extension of His kingdom was bound as closely as with the exploits of Joshua and Judas Maccabæ He was always the priest, always the ascetic. A brief of I X. is extant in which he is admonished to abate his penanc to eat meat and eggs on ordinary days of abstinence, and aside his Franciscan frock, and sleep in linen and in bed. E with all due submission to supreme authority, he would ne even at the last hour, divest himself of the habit of his ord "Even laymen," he said, "put on coarse garments wl dying; and shall I, who have worn them so long, now th them off?"

It was during the last ten years of his life, when liv daily in near prospect of his final account, that the Cardi presided over the Inquisition. During this period,

Llorente informs us, he permitted the condemnation of more than 2,500 persons to the stake, and nearly 50,000 to other punishments! But who was this Llorente? An historian, it is true; an historian of the Inquisition, of which he was at one time secretary, but a priest disgraced in 1801, a priest who adopted the sceptic philosophy of his day, and whose work was placed on the Index.* It is not from such quarters that we are to expect exact statements or fair appreciation of men like Ximenes.

The soul of ecclesiastical and military discipline is unquestioning obedience. The Cardinal's ideas of civil government were quite in keeping with this. "A prince," he used to say, "must rely mainly on his army for securing the respect and obedience of his subjects." To exalt the royal prerogative at the expense of other orders in the State was his constant aim; and to this end he was equally ready to curb the factious pride of the nobles, and the freedom of petition and complaint on the part of the people. During his regency he enforced the due administration of justice, but in accomplishing this noble end he was sometimes regardless of the Constitution and of private rights. He evaded the convocation of Cortes, though it was earnestly demanded, lest the people should grow insolent and disrespectful to authority. He proclaimed Charles king in open defiance of the rights and usages of the nation. To take counsel with those he had to govern, was, in his opinion, as if a father should learn of his children how to rule the household. The King was responsible to none but the Pope; the Pope to the Church only; the Church to God. Thus monarchy and theocracy were, in his eyes, identical; and liberty of discussion, the safeguard of all liberties, could, under his auspices, scarcely find place at a council-board and much less in a parliament.

But whatever may have been defective in Ximenes' views, his conduct was invariably ruled by a sense of duty. This was the secret of his power; for all men knew that he attached a degree of sacredness to his every act. Being ready, at any moment, to part with his own life in the service of Heaven, he took but small account of the interests and convenience of others when they stood in his way. Personal affronts he easily forgave; libels and lampoons he despised; † but it was far otherwise when religion or the State was

* See *Revue Encyclopédique*, 1823.

† See Prescott's eulogy, and Burke's in *Memoirs of Dr. Burney*, ii. 231 *et seq.*

assailed. He never enriched his family. Brothers and nephews he had, but he merely rendered them comfortable, without confiding to them important trusts. The greater part of the property he left was bequeathed, not to them, but to the University whose prosperity he had so deeply at heart. His name alone proved a rich inheritance to his kinsfolk, and enabled most of them to form distinguished alliances. Great as was the confidence he had in himself, his seeming arrogance was coupled with sincere humility. He often alluded to his lowly condition in early life, and thanked Heaven, with tears in his eyes, for its extraordinary goodness to him. He not only remembered his early friends, but performed many acts of kindness towards them. His morals were irreproachable, and he was distinguished for his sobriety and abstemiousness in the court no less than in the cloister. The frequent irregularities of the clergy at that period made him peculiarly circumspect. Quintanilla assures us that "he shunned women like so many evil spirits. Indeed, had it not been needful sometimes in the way of his calling, he would never have cast his eyes on a female."* So diligent was he in business that he seldom slept more than four hours, or at most four and a half. He was shaved in the night, and while the barber was performing he listened to some edifying reading. During meals he was entertained in the same manner, unless when, as was frequently the case, he listened to some of his theological brethren who argued on some subtle point of divinity. He kept a dwarf as a jester, according to the custom of the times,† and this was his only recreation. He had neither time nor taste for lighter and elegant amusements. His words were few, and always to the point. Idle ceremonies and useless visits were very distasteful to him, yet his position often rendered them necessary. When his visitors stayed too long, or tired him by frivolous remarks, he would often resume his reading, as Fontenelle used to drop his ear-trumpet when what he heard was no longer worth listening to.

Perhaps there may be some who would like to know a few particulars respecting Ximenes' person. It is pleasant to be able to picture to the mind the portraits of mighty men of old, for we read in their lineaments the confirmation of their history. Those of Ximenes were eminently indicative of his

* *Archetypo*, p. 80. See also Fléchier, liv. vi. p. 634.
† Von Hefele, p. 553.

mind and habits. A countenance sharp and emaciated; a sallow complexion, with an aquiline nose, and the upper lip projecting far over the lower; a pair of small eyes, deep-set, dark, and piercing; and an ample forehead without a wrinkle; —such was the face of the chief ruler in Church and State. The expression of his features was severe. The prominence of his two eye-teeth gained him the nickname of "the elephant."* His voice was not agreeable, though clear. His whole demeanour was grave; his carriage erect and firm. His presence was commanding, for his constitution, in spite of many austerities and cares, was robust, and his stature tall. Latterly, indeed, age had made him delicate, and the habits contracted in his hermitage availed not against frosts, damp, and raging heat.

There certainly never was a day in which mankind stood more in need of prelates resembling Ximenes in zeal, courage, and mortified habits. By such men only, if at all, can the wounds of divided Christendom be healed. But should ecclesiastics arise, who, not content with the cowl and the hair-shirt of the Spanish Cardinal, imitate him also in religious persecution, in reconstructing, so far as in them lies, that medieval system of government which is for ever exploded, it will be our duty to resist them as the worst enemies of the Church and of the world. With this limitation we may perfectly well echo the wish of Arnao and Von Hefele: "Would that another Ximenes were born to Spain in the nineteenth century." †

* Von Hefele, p. 553. † *Memorias*, iv. 18.

Art. VIII.—THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE.

The remarkable Conference of the Episcopate of the Anglican Communion, which was brought to a close in the middle of Advent, deserves a far more particular notice than we are able to give it in the very few pages which are all that we have at our disposal on the present occasion, inasmuch as, taken as a whole, it is perhaps the most momentous event that has occurred since the Reformation, whether we regard its immediate or future results.

In one sense it may be said to present a marked and intentional contrast to the line of conduct which circumstances forced upon the Church of England at that epoch. Then she had to act apart and in isolation from other branches of the Christian family, though consistently maintaining that the isolation was none of her seeking, and on no account to be considered a repudiation of Catholic unity. Now the guiding spirit of her action has been unity; its operation, the combination and intercommunion of Church with Church; the precise contrary of the other.

And yet in another aspect the principles contended for are the same. Formerly it was the vindication, on the unchanging basis of Church authority, of the spiritual independence of autocephalous provincial or national Churches, and the rejection of unprimitive claims at variance therewith. Now it has been the vindication of the same thing under another form, the freedom of such Churches to act together as undivided portions of one undivided whole.

Of both occasions we may say it was high time that the emperilled principle should be vindicated. The experience of to-day is proof enough of this. Follow the stream of the maintainers of the Papal Supremacy from the Reformation epoch downwards to our own time and see what they have come to. Look onwards, preserving in thought, so far as we can, the continuity of the development, and see what in a very few years they must come to. It was, indeed, time to make a stand. So much for one side. Now for the other. Starting from the same point, look down the stream of formal, and still more that of popular, Anglican theology, and see whither the mighty impulse of the former reaction was hurrying us. The merciful providence of God held back the Church whenever she spoke with authority, or, judging from the overwhelming preponderance of private opinions, she

would have made shipwreck of her spiritual claims altogether. Things had gone very hard with her when she produced a Burnet, who, after the loss of the non-jurors, was almost a representative man. Harder still when, her synods suppressed in the interest of a Hoadley, she sank down in silence and darkness to the level of the eighteenth century. Thank God her synods were silent then, when almost all true notion of the Church was gone, and she had become to all outward appearance a worm-eaten panel in the state coach, gorgeous with paint and varnish but rotten through and through. Hoadleys were common enough then, but against them did scarce even a dog move his tongue.

We of this generation, who with no little impatience fret against the evils we still see among us, can form no adequate idea of what our fathers saw in their youth. The English Church has been roused and drawn back from the edge of the precipice on which she was sleeping, and we, awake and wondering, look on at the downward rush of those who are not plunging into new and self-originated heresies, but are only holding on in the course which we were all taking a century ago.

Shut up in our little island, we had come to glory in our isolation instead of mourning it; or rather we had lost nearly all idea that things either could be or ought to be other than they were. "Pride, fulness of bread and abundance of idleness" had done their work; the State was the idol of bishops, clergy, and people, and they worshipped it with all their power. Then came the gradual sapping of the foundations of political Christianity, and when the unbelief long latent in the Church was forced out by the growth of intellectual energy, the State at once and openly ranged itself on its side. The Gorhams, the Eliots, the Essayists and Reviewers, the Stanleys, the Colensos, all are now seen to be working together to one end, in the attempt to bind the Church to the wheels of the state car, that it may be crushed to pieces in its helpless decay.

They thought she was dead already, and when the voice was first heard, "Give place, she is not dead but sleepeth," they laughed it to scorn, knowing, as they imagined, that she was dead, that isolation and unspirituality had extinguished all corporate life. So far we had drifted; whither we might yet drift the readers of the frothy malignity of the *Times* and the heavy malignity of Dr. Colenso will be able to judge.

It was high time to make a stand. The reaction from

ecclesiastical despotism unchecked and fostered had bro
us to the imminent hazard of losing all ecclesiastical autho
the vindication of lawful independence to the verge of
berate and contemptuous isolation.

But out of the very urgency of the danger God brough
liverance. The peril, once realized, was by His mercy opp
and in the right way in the main. Notwithstanding many
takes in practice, the remedy was rightly, however imperf
apprehended in theory from the first. The false prin
of isolation was to be counteracted by the true princip
combination and union. First, by individuals, through
informal but powerful agency of public meetings, Ch
unions, and the like; then by the Church herself throug
formal and authoritative medium of synods. The
Bishop of Exeter led the way; the Province of Canter
shortly afterwards followed; then, with slower and
reluctant steps, the Province of York. We can all reme
with what unerring instinct of danger every fresh develop
of synodal action was maligned and ridiculed by the w
But the work went on and prospered, and though it m
but slowly it moved surely, and has scarcely ever, if ever
occasion to write against its records, "To be undone
after." Many earnest and sagacious Churchmen may
thought that Convocation has left undone much that it
to have done, but it has not done much that it ought to
left undone. Considering the circumstances under whi
has been placed, we think few great public revivals have
kept more free from positively false steps.

Synodal action, however, is nothing but the spi
activity of a combined Episcopate, and it is easy to see
the principle once established, on however small a scal
the remedy called for by the necessities of the time,
not be confined within the narrow limits of individual
vinces. The streams were running from the mountains
they must needs converge. Communications took
between the English provincial synods; kindly greetings
exchanged between mother and daughter Churches,
between the daughter Churches among themselves. The
the far-off South, in one of the smallest of Ecclesias
Provinces, broke out deadly heresy, and forthwith not
province only but the whole Anglican Communion was
The pulse of a common life and a common love vib
throughout the entire body. The legal position of the Ch
in the colonies had already been shown to be involve
doubt and confusion, and when the spiritual action of

South African province had been declared legally null and void, the Church was thrown on herself alone for the vindication of her inherent authority. The internal conditions of the English Communion called for a further development of combined synodical action for the defence of the common faith and the maintenance of common discipline.

Running parallel with the above-named events there had been for years a gradually increasing desire for the renewal of fraternal relations not only with all parts of our own immediate Communion but with the whole Catholic body. How it first arose none can say; it was the work of the Spirit according to His Own Will. As in the other instance so here, the movement began with individuals; in private prayers, in private action; then in combined action, the formation of societies, the A.P.U.C., and the Eastern Church Association. Soon it began to assume its rightful place in Synodal Assemblies; in the American Church first, immediately afterwards in our own. Standing committees were appointed, mutual co-operation sought and obtained. The fruits were soon apparent. The heart of the East began to open to us in a wonderful manner, in multiplied acts of friendliness, in isolated instances of actual Communion, in formal though non-official conferences. Even the Western Church was not wholly unmoved. Hundreds of Roman Catholics joined the A.P.U.C., a marked reaction began to take place in some quarters against the preposterous claims of the Ultramontanes, and it began to seem not impossible to grave and sober theologians among ourselves that terms of agreement might eventually be framed on which the English Church might unite with the moderate Roman party. The way was not seen to anything more than this: to all human understanding it is easier for a camel to go through the needle's eye than for the genuine Catholic and the Ultramontane elements to combine. They do not really combine even in the Roman Communion itself, and it is altogether impossible that even an apparent combination should extend beyond it.

Still, even the West was not wholly barren ground; the well-worn *dictum* of De Maistre was not forgotten; and the result of the whole movement found expression in various ways, among which we may mention the establishment of this REVIEW, the Sermons and Essays on Re-union, and the famous Eirenicon with its consequences. Naturally, however, it was in the direction of the East, as we have said, where there are fewer substantial and traditional obstacles to be surmounted, that the hopes of Re-union were least clouded; and it was in

that direction, therefore, that the most favourable opportunities might be expected to arise.

In both our internal and external relations, then, everything seemed ripe for some unusual action. Until that period in our domestic Ecclesiastical history to which we brought down our summary the two streams had flowed on apart, with the exception of the cautious and tentative measures adopted by the American synods and our own. There had been no corporate effort made to bind the Mother Church of England more closely to her many daughters, and at the same time and by the same agency to stretch out hands of love and affection to the Churches of the two great sister Communions. But the time was now come, and the way was wonderful. Isolation and its resultant Erastianism had in their blind rashness overreached themselves; the barriers which seemed to shut in the Churches of the British Empire suddenly crumbled away, and the spiritual bodies, with their spiritual life renewed, immediately coalesced in a great act of corporate unity, at the very moment when the needs of their own communion demanded a re-assertion of the one unchanging faith, and when that re-assertion would fall with the best effect on the prepared minds of the other great branches of the Church. What had Mr. Long, what had the Privy Council, what had Dr. Colenso, to do with the Re-union of Christendom? Precisely what they had to do in preparing the way for the Lambeth Council. The two great questions of the spiritual and legal independence of Churches and the essential unity of all branches of the Catholic family are in their reality one. We never thought of these things a while ago; we saw them only apart when we began to see them at all; now we are learning to see them in union as a stereoscopic whole. And what a vision it is: a vision of beauty, yet not visionary.

When we realize this, it will no longer seem at all wonderful (as it might do otherwise) that the Re-union element should have obtained such a striking prominence in the proceedings of the Lambeth Conference. There was scarcely an alternative. The only principles on which the Bishops could effect their immediate object were the essential and immutable principles of the unity of the Universal Church. Look, for instance, at Resolutions VIII. and IV. of the September Session, which enunciate the bases of Anglican intercommunion. *Mutatis mutandis*, they are equally applicable as an Eirenicon for all Christendom. Or look at the still more remarkable "Introduction" to the Resolutions. The Resolutions refer to the wants of one branch; the Introduction, to

those of the whole Vine. There is nothing local about it. The few words which seem so are really otherwise. To speak of "Bishops of Christ's Holy Catholic Church in visible communion with the United Church of England and Ireland," points to a communion of Churches which is real, though as yet invisible. To say they profess the faith "maintained by the Primitive Church and by the Fathers of the English Reformation," is to bind fast the Reformation to the faith of the Primitive Church. But the chief force of the "Introduction" lies in its direct statements, which are three; of which the first is that they thank God for bringing the Council together; the others, an earnest longing cry to our Heavenly Father for the re-union of the divided flock of Christ, and a solemn record of their conviction of the means by which it must be effectually promoted. We need not quote the words, which will be familiar we hope to our readers; we will only say they leave nothing to be desired.

The breadth and comprehensiveness of this "Introduction" do not dwarf the following Resolutions, but throw them into their right place, and give them their just proportions as regulations for setting in order that one portion of the "divided flock" committed to the especial pastorate of the Anglican Bishops. But we cannot for a moment forget that they are not acting as Bishops of a perfect and self-sufficient Church, but as an integral part of the one Universal Episcopate, in submission and obedience to the authority of the whole body.

The same spirit pervaded all their proceedings. In the opening address of the Primate, "The best way of promoting the Re-union of Christendom" is the first specified subject for consideration, and is warmly commended to the assembled bishops.

The Encyclical is undoubtedly the specific result of their deliberations on that "head." Nominally addressed to the faithful of the Anglican Communion, it is in reality, and is designed to be, a manifesto to the whole Church, and an explicit acceptance of the principles of Re-union laid down in the above-mentioned "Introduction." It is as if they had said to all Churches, "We long and pray above all things for Re-union; these are the means by which it must be attained. Brethren, we for our own part, and by enjoining those under our charge to follow us, for them also, profess faithfully and will firmly maintain these principles. As far as in us lies we hold out to you the right hand of fellowship." Above and beyond its significance as a pastoral monition to their own

people it has another character as an Encyclical invitation to general Re-union on a primitive basis.

So that its translation into Greek and Latin with a view to universal circulation was not a happy afterthought but a natural and logical consequence of its adoption. This, too, explains the singularly restrained and conciliatory manner in which it touches on subjects which could not conscientiously be ignored; a manner so restrained and conciliatory that even Archbishop Manning himself said there was nothing in it with which a Roman Catholic need refuse concurrence. There is throughout these passages of the Encyclical an evidently studied desire not to overcharge our brethren, or to make Churches responsible for more than their formal authority has officially sanctioned.

Beyond this and the translation of the Pastoral into Latin little could be done in the West. The prevailing tendencies of the Roman Catholic Episcopate would have made it extremely difficult to draw up an acceptable letter to them corresponding to the one addressed to the Oriental Bishops. Perhaps, however, we may fairly regret that the experiment was not made; though with the standing example of the bad speed periodically encountered by the Church of Holland in her dealings with the Roman See, and the ungracious reception experienced by the A. P. U. C., the prospect cannot be considered at all encouraging, and we are therefore ready to believe that the Archbishop of Canterbury has acted judiciously in not making the attempt for the present. The tenor of his letter to the Eastern Bishops proves that his silence is actuated by no want of charity. We have rarely read an official document which gave us more unfeigned gladness than that letter, equally characterized as it is by episcopal dignity and fraternal gentleness. Taken in connection with the Encyclical itself we may surely hope that its effect will be most beneficial.

Another very significant indication of the same spirit pervading the Bishops, all the more marked from its almost impromptu character, was the fourth Resolution of the adjourned Conference, "That his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to convey to the Church in Russia an expression of the sympathy of the Anglican Communion with that Church, in the loss which it has sustained by the death of his Eminence Philarete, the venerable Metropolitan of Moscow." Such condolences, sent in the name of the whole "Anglican Communion," are far more than mere conventionalities; they are the yearnings of a brotherly spirit ready to lay hold on every opportunity of making itself known and

felt, and as such they have much more than a transitory value.

Such then, not less than the desire to remedy our own special evils, was the guiding aspiration of the Lambeth Council of 1867. It may be called the first definite step towards corporate Re-union officially taken by any of the three great branches of the Church. Like all first steps it may seem, as indeed it is, weak and uncertain, but it is none the less a real advance in that much-desired direction. Its consequences have to be waited for. Its successors are yet to come. But news have already reached us from the East of the favourable reception of the Archbishop's letters, while nearer home the Resolutions and Encyclical have called out a noticeable pamphlet from a member of the Eastern Communion, in which he allows that if these are really the tenets and principles of the Anglican Church there is no substantial hindrance to her union with the Oriental Churches. It is not surprising that he imagines these documents to be incompatible with an acceptance of some of our present formulæ, but the discrepancy is apparent and not real, and he is not so much responsible for the mistake as the multitudes of our own Communion who have interpreted those formulæ in a sense wholly inconsistent with the primitive and Apostolic faith. Let them be rightly explained and the apparent incongruity will vanish. Mutual explanations must be the pathway to Re-union, and we, no less than others, must be content to explain.

We have seen the beginning of a system of which we cannot yet see the end. The Lambeth Conference has closed, but it is not dead. It will live again hereafter with greater confidence and still greater results. Every resolution, every act of the Council that has ended points to others yet to come. We believe the same spirit of unity will prevail in them all.

It may be said that not only has little been done, but that it is all on one side; that neither East nor West has given any responsive sign. Well; be it so: everything must take time, and the peacemaker must come before the peace. All we say is, the work has been begun, and by God's mercy begun by ourselves. It is one of the most sweet assurances that God is with us in the way wherein we go, because "Beati pacifici, quoniam filii Dei vocabuntur."

The remarkable petition from the Nestorian Christians to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London deserves a passing notice in connection with this subject; for as the mind of the English Primate has been so much occupied of late with the thoughts of unity, so singular and

in some respects so touching an application cannot fail to move him deeply. If it be, as Dr. Neale believed, that most of these separated bodies are now only nominally heretical, and have lost all active attachment to, and perhaps all definite comprehension of, the distinctive tenets of their sect, then there may be something more than hope of their recovery to the unity of the Church. We fully agree with a writer in the *Church News* that the way to deal with such bodies, sunk in ignorance and misery as by their own confession they are, is to teach them positive truth so far as they will bear it, without special reference to their traditional errors. . It is very likely that they would not know that they were unlearning as well as learning. And here is possibly a field in which no Church could work so well as our own. As Nestorians they have a traditional horror of the Orthodox Oriental Communion, and their petition to our Bishops shows how inveterate a repugnance they have to Rome. Of ourselves they probably know little more than that we claim to be a branch of the Catholic Church and are neither Orientals nor Roman Catholics. But they seem willing to confide in our charity and to take us very much on trust. We should have more chance with them than others. If we could so far come to an understanding with the Orthodox East as to be allowed in fraternal charity to send missionaries to these poor Nestorians, it is not wholly impossible that they might receive the fulness of the truth, and in due time, when they loved the truth more than tradition and Catholic brotherhood more than Sectarian prejudice, might be ready to confess the faith of Ephesus and be corporately re-united to the Body of Christ.

Space fails us, and we must conclude. Scant justice has been done to the subject before us, even in the very partial aspect in which alone we have allowed ourselves to consider it. But we think enough has been said to show that to regard the Lambeth Synod as nothing more than a conference on the internal affairs of our own Communion would be a grave historical error, and would deprive it of one of its most characteristic features. Full of hope as it is for the future of our more immediate Communion, it is not less full of hope for the future Re-union of the whole of Christendom, and it gives a most cheering earnest of the part which the English Church may bear in its accomplishment.

Art. IX.—S. JOHN DAMASCENE.

The writings of the holy fathers, generally, bear the same relation to the Christian Church, and to the New Testament, as the Books called Apocryphal do to the Synagogue, and to the Old Testament. Though not, in the strict sense of the word, inspired; that is to say, not free from all taint of human imperfection; they are yet not common or unclean, not such as could be produced by men devoid of the spirit of revelation. And both are, therefore, to be treated with respect, as sacred, divine, and holy; and received as the work of that special dispensation of Divine Providence, which, in all ages, guides and teaches the Church.

One consequence of this mixed character, possessed by the works of the holy fathers, is, that they possess a very varying amount of authority and value. *All Scripture is given by inspiration of God*, and therefore all *is profitable;* whereas this cannot be said of all the works of the fathers:—so long as they give utterance to the general voice of the Church, their words are the words of the Church; and, as far as their writings are acknowledged and approved by universal consent, they are worthy of our utmost deference, and cannot be rejected without presumption; but what they say in their private and individual capacity, may be worthless, or positively erroneous. Consequently, the writings of some of them are far more valuable and worthy of respect than those of others. And even different works of the same father may widely differ, in weight and authority. All their authority depends upon the estimation in which they are held by the Church:—their literary merit necessarily depends upon the individual endowments of the writer.

Regarded in this light, the works of S. John Damascene claim a most conspicuous place in our regard. Whether we consider their intrinsic value, the period at which they were produced, the estimation in which they have ever been held by the entire Church, or their bearing upon many of the doctrinal controversies of our own day; it would be difficult to name any writer who is more worthy of our attention. The merits of his most important works, we shall endeavour to point out: but first shall indicate certain incidental circumstances, which concur in imparting additional interest and value to them.

John, called Mansur by the Arabians, was born of pious

and illustrious parents, at Damascus in Syria, whence the name by which he is best known; although, more properly, he is called Chrysorrhoas from his eloquence, or rather, perhaps, from the value of his writings. He was brought up by a monk, S. Kosmas, called the Agiopolite, from Jerusalem, the place of his birth. This Kosmas, having been seized by Saracen marauders, was redeemed by S. John's father, who received him into his house, and employed him to instruct John, and another Kosmas, called the Melodist; who afterwards became Bishop of Majuma, near Gaza, and who was adopted by S. John's father. From the facts of the redemption of S. Kosmas the Agiopolite, and the adoption of S. Kosmas the Poet, as well as their future destiny, a most favourable notion must be formed of the character of the family to which S. John belonged.

On the death of his father, John succeeded him in his office of Councillor to the Caliph of Damascus, and was treated with much distinction. But, by his vigorous opposition to the Iconoclast heresy, he incurred the violent hostility of the Emperor, Leo the Isaurian; who, to ruin him with his master, caused a letter to be forged in John's name, offering to betray the city to the Christians. This letter, falling as was intended, into the Caliph's hands, he hastily ordered S. John's hands to be cut off; but was soon convinced of the treachery of the Imperial forger, and wished to retain John in his service; but the saint, confounded at the baseness of one who was nominally a Christian, and grieving at the scandal which such conduct would reflect upon the profession of the truth, amongst the infidels, retired to the monastery of S. Saba, where he was ordained priest, and spent the remainder of his life; devoting himself to the advocacy of the true faith, with all the power of his mind. It was here, that he produced those works which have always commanded the admiration of all who have carefully studied them.

The period was that of the commencement of that heresy, which gave occasion to the assembly of the last Œcumenical Council; and thus it happened, that S. John was the last writer of note, whose works were formally and unanimously approved, by the acclamations of the assembled and as yet undivided Church. This alone would give his works a special value, which however is vastly enhanced by their intrinsic merit. The talent of John was indeed peculiarly adapted to the circumstances of his time. And in this, the Providence of God is strikingly displayed: perhaps there never existed any writer who equalled him, in his power of digesting and

recapitulating the teaching of his predecessors; at the same time, his works possess a homogeneity and individuality, which seem to stamp them with the seal of originality. There is not a statement, scarcely a phrase, in his writings, which had not been anticipated, and for which the authority of precedent could not be claimed; and yet, although his works owe so much to compilation, it would be incorrect to say that they are mere abridgments or collations; for such is the harmony, and at the same time the profundity, with which they are combined, that many thoughts and observations, perhaps indistinctly apprehended by their individual authors, are, by the approximation of their separate expressions, more clearly elucidated; and, above all, throughout all his works, the character of unity of plan is most carefully maintained.

The most important of S. John's works may be thus classified:—I. His philosophical works. II. Sacred parallels. III. Dogmatic writings. IV. Sacred poetry. V. Sermons.

The philosophy of S. John may be described as a rectification of the peripatetic, which is, indeed, the only truly scientific system. It is now almost needless to point out, that the ancients in no way differed from the moderns, as to the rules by which truth is to be discovered, or certitude to be established. Reason, experience, and faith; the motives of credibility, the value of testimony, have been equally recognised, in all ages, by all systematic thinkers; nor does the reproach cast by the Utilitarians of our day, upon the speculative tendencies of the ancient philosophers, appear to us to be founded in justice. Whilst they manifested a preference for speculative truth, they did not omit to point out the right path for practical inquiries; the only point in which, if any, they were deficient, was that they did not recognise the importance of the material well-being of mankind, to the extent to which it is insisted upon in our time.

In truth, it would be more consistent to reproach the mechanicians of early times, for not being philosophers, than to condemn the philosophers for not being mechanics. Each department of study is useful in its kind; and at the present day we find that mental philosophers, logicians, metaphysicians, and moralists, are, as a rule, not a whit more conversant with the applied sciences than they were in the time of Aristotle and Plato: but, on the other hand, the mechanical arts have been enormously developed; and, indeed, entirely reconstructed, by being placed upon a logical and philosophical basis.

It is due to the popular disfavour, with which, in our time,

the studies of mental philosophy and metaphysics are regarded, that they have been conducted with so little respect to general experience, and common sense: before a man can resolve to penetrate into the depths of the science, he must have divorced himself in great measure from the general opinion of his fellows; and it has generally, if not always, happened, that in so doing he has at the same time bid adieu to common methods of arriving at truth; and being fully convinced of the exceptional nature of his studies, he has come to the conclusion that they require an exceptional method of investigation: this is the only way we can account for the extraordinary conclusions which have been arrived at by the majority of those who have made these subjects their study.

After all, the philosophy of S. John does in fact little more, than insure that accuracy and precision of statement, which is absolutely necessary, in dealing with such an important and profound science as Theology; the logician, and the metaphysician, were not the inventors of the words, existence, essence, being, thing, substance, individual, person, genus, species, relation, property, time, space, and the like; neither were they the original propounders of the notions they are intended to convey; all they profess to do is, to fix the significance of such terms, and to discuss, in a systematic manner, the ideas to which they are attached.

The Philosophy of S. John is contained in his "*Dialectic*," consisting of sixty-five letters, addressed to his foster-brother, Kosmas of Majuma; in his "*First Institutes*," a treatise dedicated to John, Bishop of Laodicea; and in seven chapters of "*Physics*." Philosophy is love of wisdom; wisdom, that is, in its highest and widest acceptation, speculative and practical: hence, the knowledge and love of God is, in truth, the highest philosophy; but, inasmuch as this knowledge and affection is unattainable by our unassisted natural powers, and requires a Divine Revelation to guide us to it, the term Philosophy, which has been adopted from the heathen writers, is restricted to that pursuit of wisdom, which is attainable by the natural powers of man. Thus restricted, philosophy is to be defined as the knowledge of things by their real nature; or, as the knowledge of things by their higher causes. The object from which all philosophical inquiry starts, is "that much talked-of animal, man." Man, then, is a single, compound being ("body and soul are one man"), consisting at once of flesh and spirit, soul and body; the anthropologist studies the whole man; the anatomist and physiologist study the

body; the psychologist studies the mind. Both the materialist and the spiritualist deny obvious facts, which can only be adequately recognised by him who admits the objectivity of the mind, and at the same time, its intimate union with the body; which is its instrument, and which, in the present state of existence, controls and modifies its manifestations. It is at the points of contact between mind and matter that the most valuable information respecting their mutual relations is to be sought; and hence arises the fallacy of those methods of research, "in which mind has been studied by metaphysicians, altogether without reference to its material instruments; whilst the frame has been dissected out by anatomists, and analysed by chemists, as if they expected to map out the course of thought, or to weigh or measure the intensity of emotion."* The essential reality of both mind and body, must then be constantly admitted, as also the unity of being, resulting from both. Still, the superiority of the mind, as regards function and permanence, is never to be lost sight of; "the peculiarities of individual animals depend upon certain peculiarities of action; for the doctrine of absorption teaches us, that of actual substance (matter), nothing is permanent; but all suffers an incessant revolution and change, of which nothing can remain but certain peculiarities of action." † Further than this, the mental philosopher does not carry his observation of the human body, but relinquishes that to the physicist; whilst he continues his investigation of the force of the body, the mind. S. John divides mental phenomena into the vegetative, the intellectual, and the rational; but since he refers all pure knowledge to the intellectual, whilst to the rational he refers all that relates to action, it is more consistent with modern language to divide the human soul into the vital, the knowing, and the willing; and just as the anatomist finds it convenient to describe each muscle in a limb, separately, although there is scarcely a single movement of the body which is not produced by the combined action of several; so the psychologist, although he knows that in almost every act of the mind these several powers combine their action, yet he also finds it convenient to study each apart, before observing their combined effects. Thus, then, to the vital principle, chiefly belong nutrition, development, growth, and generation; to the knowing—consciousness, sensation, simple perception, and apprehension; to the willing—whatever is voluntary. The

* Carpenter, *Human Physiology*, p. 547.

† *Anatomy of the Human Body*, by Charles Bell. London: 1804, vol. iv. p. 257.

vegetative, or vital, is possessed by man in common with plants and animals; the knowing, in common with animals; the willing, at least in its highest development, is peculiar to man: whence man is most properly defined as, "a rational animal." For, if we define the knowing as a consciousness of existence, and of certain conditions of such existence—and the willing as an instinctive motion towards that which is—or is supposed to be—good, the element of moral determination is essential to the perfection of the will, and this is not possessed by brutes.*

The consideration of those functions, which mainly depend upon the vital power, are closely connected with the science of physiology, and do not occupy much of the attention of the psychologist; hence it is the knowing and the willing in their several manifestations which constitute the proper study of the mental philosopher: he commences with sensation, general and special. So long as the senses remain in a state of strict passivity, they are actuated solely by the knowing; but immediately they become directed by attention, the willing comes into play and they become subject to its control. The same is the case with thought: so long as the mind continues passive, in a state of pure perception or recollection, the knowing alone acts; but immediately intention directs the thought, the willing takes the lead, and guides the perceptive or recollective power, according to choice. On the other hand: so long as the will acts in consequence of deliberation or choice, so long does it retain its control; but when, by means of a preponderating and sudden impression on the knowing, an irrational impulse is produced; the will loses its pre-eminence, and in general, the more a man is influenced by passion or impulse the more he loses that power, which is the chief distinction between him and the brutes.

Thought, then, is produced by the combined action of the knowing and the willing. But in order to arrive at a just notion of the phenomenon of thought, it is further necessary to take into consideration a certain conformity and correlation, which really subsists between the psychical powers of man, and the rest of the universe by which he is surrounded: just

* At the risk of being considered fanciful, we would point out the very striking fact that, as a means of communication between each of these powers of the soul, and the body, there is appropriated a corresponding division of the nervous system. The sympathetic nerve, which supplies all the organs of organic life, is the instrument of the vital power: the afferent nerves, and the nerves of special sense, pertain to the knowing: and the efferent nerves, or the nerves of voluntary motion, are the messengers, carrying the stimulus of the will to the immediate organs of voluntary motion.

as we admit a like conformity between the nutritive powers and the food. It would avail nothing for man to possess such a marvellously organised alimentary system, did not nature afford a suitable and corresponding material for it to assimilate. It is the same with the mind. And thus we arrive at our knowledge of the objective existence of the true and the good: the true, resulting from the conformity between the knowing power and its objects; the good, pertaining to the conformity between the willing and the rest of the universe.

Recognising all these facts, which form the basis of all philosophical inquiry, the peripatetic system, as adopted and corrected by S. John, regularly investigates all the phenomena resulting from the relations existing between man and the universe of truth, goodness, and beauty, of which he forms a part; and at every step of the inquiry necessarily points to that Supreme Force, vital, intelligent, and willing, by which all these inferior forces, as well as the matter subject to them, are brought into being, and constantly controlled. In consequence of this reasonable and just method of inquiry, the only one deserving of the name of scientific, all those absurd fancies which, during the last three or four centuries have been advanced under the name of philosophy, apparently with the express motive of bewildering mankind, are simply put out of court: they are all beside the question, and no more affect the genuine conclusions of the mental philosopher, than they do the doctrines of gravitation, or of the circulation of the blood.

In his book of Sacred Parallels, S. John brings together, under different heads, appropriate lessons from Scripture and the fathers upon various points of morality and religion. It is a work of great merit, clearly showing the vast learning of the author, as well as his peculiar talent for compilation; and would well repay any translator, who would undertake to reproduce it in an English version.

But it is his "Accurate Edition of the Orthodox Faith" which is the most valuable work of S. John, as well as the most important to the modern reader: living, as he did, at the commencement of the middle ages; before the reign of ignorance, innovation, and scholasticism, and the decline of scientific knowledge; the last of the fathers—for to him this title properly belongs—brought to the work of exposition of Church Dogma, the talents of a penetrating sagacity and vast erudition. At the same time he was gifted with such humility, that he can scarcely be said to have originated any thing, even in the way of expression. This work is, accordingly, rather a cento from the works of the fathers than an

original composition; and yet it is composed with such skill that its unity is perfect. It resembles rather a protracted symbol than a scientific treatise, although it is properly regarded as the first systematic treatise on Christian Theology. And herein consists the peculiar value of this work, that it gives us a summary of Divinity, at the very termination of the period which produced its most valuable utterances. The Providence of God seems to be displayed, as we have already said, in the special aptitude for this work, with which S. John was endowed, and the period at which it was exercised. It was written late enough to comprise all the observations of the most talented expositions of the Christian faith, and yet early enough to obtain the formal approbation of the "undivided Church." We here have summed up, so to speak, all the scattered utterances of Christian doctrine, before the succession of tradition was in any way interrupted; and this summary met with unanimous acceptance and approval both in the East and the West,* before the schism of the latter. S. John was the last doctor of the "undivided Church," as well as the father of dogmatic theology, as a science.

In the form in which it is now usually met with, the work consists of four books, the first treating of pure Theology, *Θεολόγια ἁπλη*, that is to say, doctrines relating to God Himself alone, without any reference to creatures. The three last, containing œconomic theology, *Θεολόγια οἰκονόμικη*, which signifies doctrines respecting God, in relation to creatures; the second Book gives an account of creation; the third, which is the longest, is entirely devoted to the Incarnation; and the fourth book contains the exposition of the doctrines of the Church, the Sacraments, and other subjects. But this division into four books did not exist in the work in its original form. Some have even doubted whether S. John left any divisions in it at all, for the style is continuous from beginning to end. But from internal evidence it is clear that as it left the author's hands it was divided into chapters, not numbered, but with a title to each. This accounts for the great variation which is to be found in the number of the chapters in different editions, scarcely any two being exactly alike in this respect. The division into books is certainly

* It was reserved for Aquinas (than whom no one is more indebted to S. John, both for his philosophy and his theology), to insinuate that in his strict adherence to the doctrine of his predecessors, on the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone, S. John was a follower of Nestorius! (P. I., Qy. XXXVI., Art. II., *ad* 3m.)

convenient, and we shall now give a brief digest of their contents.

Reason, being the gift of the same God who is the author of Revelation, is legitimately employed in studying and investigating the truths which Revelation has made known. Revelation, being addressed to man, is addressed to a reasonable being; but the very first fact which reason arrives at, on being confronted with Revelation, is its own insufficiency. It is with this truth, therefore, that theology commences: and thus, at starting, clears its path from any obstacles which the perversity of man's intellect might raise up. God Himself is incomprehensible to us, and reason concurs with revelation in assuring us of that truth, as fully as it does in assuring us of the truth of God's existence. Hence "supposing a revelation to be made, it must contain many things very different from what we should have expected." "Christianity is a scheme quite beyond our comprehension."* Accordingly, when once we are convinced, by reasonable evidence, of the truth of the Christian revelation, we can have no hesitation in receiving whatever that revelation teaches. Still, in many cases, and especially in fundamental points, we are gratified by the discovery that reason goes hand in hand with revelation in assuring us of the truth of many of its doctrines: thus, besides the existence of God, we have recourse to reason to prove His unity, His eternity, omnipotence, and goodness, and other essential attributes. Of these attributes some are such as are capable of expression; others, although we can form some notion of them, are either such as we cannot by any means express, or else such as are most conveniently described by negatives; in general, however, whatever contributes to describe infinite perfection may be said of God affirmatively. It is thus that S. John treats of the essential attributes of the Godhead; he then proceeds to the doctrine of the Trinity, which necessarily transcends reason, and is derived from revelation alone. He shows how this mystery was faintly shadowed forth to the Jews, and then enters at large into a sublime exposition of it in the fulness of that light which the Gospel throws upon it. Grounding his arguments mainly upon the doctrines of the unchangeableness and unity of God and the reality of His Paternity, he shows how the eternal generation of the Son necessarily follows upon these truths, and how the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost completes them; whilst the circumincession manifests

* Butler's *Analogy*, Part II. ch. iv.

the essential unity, as an actual consequence of the Trinity. The procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone must be carefully upheld, otherwise we must either admit two principles in the Godhead, or else bring in a duality as well as a Trinity.

The second book, commencing with the sixteenth chapter, after treating of age, the angels, and demons, proceeds to give an account of the material universe, in which the received cosmology is, of course, the only available theory; but it is remarkable that S. John, unlike the schoolmen—who rashly incorporated the current physical theories of their time with theology—carefully points out that he merely adopts received opinions, and offers them for what they are worth, without making himself responsible for them; hence, although his account of creation unavoidably contains many absurdities, yet, wherever it bears upon religion, his observations are surprisingly accurate and reverent. Having concluded his description of the natural world, he gives an explanation of Paradise:—

"There are some who imagine Paradise to be obvious to sense, others consider that it is purely intellectual; but I rather judge, that as man is created at the same time sentient and intelligent, so also was this most sacred temple, at the same time sensible and intellectual, having a twofold aspect: for the body it was an abiding in that most divine and beautiful region, which we have described; but for the soul a continuance in the higher, and incomparable, and most excellent of all places; having God for house and host, and having Him for a most glorious garment, and an investiture with His grace, and a nourishment with that only sweetest food of contemplation of Him, as another angel. Wherefore, the tree of life is worthily so called, for it bestows upon those who partake of it, a life not interrupted by death, [that is to say] the sweetness of Divine Communion, which, therefore, God called *every tree*, for He said: *Of every tree that is in Paradise shalt thou eat for food.* For He is All, in Whom, and by Whom, all things subsist. But the tree of knowledge of good and evil is the knowledge of manifold speculation: that is, the knowledge of one's own nature, which is good indeed in those who are perfect, and who addict themselves to Divine contemplation * * * * but is not good in those who are but young, and more intemperate in their appetite."

Having completed the development of this explanation of Paradise, he enters upon his anthropology, physical, and

psychical. This occupies twenty-one sections, or seventeen of the numbered chapters, successively treating of man as soul and body, of pleasure, pain, fear, anger, imagination, sensation, thought, memory, the internal and uttered word, affection, and operation; then of the will, the voluntary and involuntary, of that which is in our power, that is, free will, the cause of free will, of things not in our power, and thus of Providence and predestination. The most characteristic of these sections is that on free will:—

"With regard to the account to be given of free will, that is, of things that are in our power; the first question is, whether there be anything in our power, for there are many who dispute this: a second is, what are the things which are in our power, and over which we have control: thirdly, the cause has to be sought, wherefore God, Who made us, made us free of will. Entering therefore upon the first question, we shall first deal with it by showing, from what is admitted by those who deny it, that there are some things in our power. And we argue thus: Of all things which are done, they say, that either God is their cause, or else necessity, or fate, or nature, or fortune, or an automaton. But the work of God, is being and Providence; that of necessity, is those things which have always the self-same movement: that of fate, is that which is accomplished by necessity, of itself; that of nature, is generation, increase, corruption, plants, and animals; that of fortune, rare and unexpected events. For they define fortune to be: from the coincidence and concurrence of two causes, having their origin in choice, for something else than what was intended, to be produced; such as the finding of a treasure on digging a grave; for neither did he who hid the treasure, do so that another might find it; nor did he who found it, dig for the purpose of finding treasure; but the one, that, when he would, he might recover it, the other that he might dig a grave: so that somewhat else must have concurred besides that which each proposed to himself. The work of that which is automatic is, whatever befals inanimate or irrational beings, without nature or art. This is their doctrine. But now; to which of these are we to attribute the actions of men, if man is neither the cause nor the origin of actions? For it is not lawful to attribute shameful or unjust acts to God; nor yet to necessity; for they are not among those things which are always the same; nor to fate, for they do not affirm that fate pertains to contingencies, but to necessary things; nor to nature, for the works of nature are animals and plants; nor to fortune, for

the actions of man are not rare and unexpected; nor to an automaton, for it is the accidents of inanimate and irrational things, that they say pertain to the automatic. It remains, that man himself, who acts, and performs, is the origin of his own works, and has free will.

"Again, if man be in no wise the author of action, his having deliberation would be superfluous; for why would he exercise deliberation, supposing he were not the master of any action? For all deliberation is for the sake of action. And, to represent the very best and most honourable thing in man, as something superfluous, would be the height of absurdity; and hence, if he deliberate, it is for the sake of action; for all deliberation is on account of action, and through action."

The third book, as we have already said, is entirely devoted to the doctrine of the Incarnation; and contains the most complete exposition of the great mystery of godliness, which is anywhere to be found. As an example of the nature of the reasoning here employed, we shall give part of the Chapter against the Monophysites:—

"The Natures were united to each other, unchangeably and unalterably: neither the Divine Nature departing from its own simplicity, nor certainly the human being either changed into the nature of Godhead, or going away into non-existence; nor yet of the two, one compound nature being formed. For a compound nature cannot be consubstantial with either of the two natures of which it is composed; being, in fact, a completely different one from either of them:—just as a body, composed of the four elements, is neither said to be consubstantial with fire, nor is it said to be air, nor water, nor earth, nor is it consubstantial with any of them; if then, according to the heretics, Christ, after the union, were a person of one compound nature; from a simple nature, He must have become changed into a compound, and was neither consubstantial with the Father, Who is of a simple Nature, nor with His mother (for she was not composed of Divinity and humanity); nor is He in the Divinity and humanity; nor will He be styled God or man, but only Christ. And Christ will be not the title of His Person, but (as they say), of the one nature. Whereas we lay it down as a doctrine, that Christ is not of one compound nature, nor of different natures, a something different, (as, for instance, of soul and body, there is man; or as, of four elements there may be a body), but that, of different natures He has the very same. For we confess, that of Divinity and humanity, there is, and is said to be, one

self-same Person; perfect God and perfect Man, and that He is of the two, and in the two Natures.

"But we say that Christ is the title of His Person, not as though it were spoken one-sidedly, but as being indicative of the two Natures. For He Himself anointed Himself, as God anointing the Body with His Divinity; but as Man being anointed, for He Himself is both the one and the other, (that is, God and man,) and the Divinity is the Unction of the Humanity.

"For, if Christ were of one composite Nature, and were consubstantial with the Father, then also the Father would be composite and consubstantial with the Flesh, which is absurd and full of blasphemy. * * * But this it is which gives rise to the error of the heretics, namely, the speaking of Nature and Person as the self-same thing.

"Now, when we say that the nature of men is one, we must be understood to say this, not as having an eye to the consideration of soul and body, (for it is impossible to say that the soul and the body, as compared one with the other, are one of nature), but since there are very many persons of men, and all receive the same description of nature, (for all are composed of soul and body, and all share alike in the nature of the soul, and possess the substance of the body and have a common form), we say there is one nature of very many and divers persons, each person manifestly having two natures and being in two perfect natures; I speak of the soul and the body.

"But in the case of our Lord Jesus Christ, we have no common species to refer to, for there never was, nor is, nor ever will be, another Christ, of Divinity and humanity, perfect God and perfect Man. Wherefore we must not, in reference to our Lord Jesus Christ, speak of one nature as if the case of an individual, composed of soul and body, were like that of Christ, of Divinity and humanity. For in the former case, there is an individual, whereas Christ is not an individual (relative to a species.) For there is not a Christhood of such a sort as that species may be predicted of it; for species is not predicted of such a nature as that of Christ.

"Wherefore, of two perfect natures, the Divine and human, we say there results an union, not in the way of combination, or confusion, or blending, or tempering together, as said the frenzied Dioscorus, Eutyches, Severus, and all that profane crew: nor yet in the form of a mask or habit, or as to dignity, or equality of honour, or identity of name, of acquiescence; as said the detested Nestorius, Diodorus, and Theodore

of Mopsuestia, and all that demon-possessed company: but in the way of conjunction, that is to say, personally, unchangeably, unconfusedly, unalterably, indivisibly, and inseparably, and in two natures retaining their perfectness, we confess one Person of the Son of God, Incarnate, asserting the self-same Person of His Divinity and Humanity, and acknowledging that the two natures remain entire in Him after the union, not placing each of them separately and apart, but mutually united in one conjoint Personality.

* * * * * * *

"Wherefore also the Lord of Glory is said to have been crucified, although His divine Nature suffered not; and the Son of Man, before the Passion, is acknowledged to be in heaven, as the Lord Himself said. For the Lord of Glory was one and the same with Him who was, in nature and verity, the Son of Man, that is, who had become man.

"We know, too, that the miracles, as well as the sufferings are His; although He, the self-same Person, wrought the miracles after one fashion, and endured the sufferings after another. For we know that even as His Person is maintained as one, so also the substantial differences of the natures are preserved. But how shall distinctiveness be maintained, when those things which contain the distinction, relatively to each other, are not maintained? For distinctiveness, is a distinctiveness of things that differ. In whatever way, then, the Natures of Christ differ from one another, that is to say, in the way of substance, we say that He is allied with the extremes—as regards the Divinity, with the Father and the Spirit—and as regards the humanity with His Mother and us.

"For the self-same is consubstantial, as regards the Divinity, with the Father and the Holy Spirit; and as regards the humanity, with His Mother and all mankind.

"But, in whatever respect His natures are allied, we say that He differs from the Father and the Spirit, as also from His Mother and the rest of mankind. For His natures are allied by hypostasis, retaining one conjoint personality, according to which He differs, both from the Father and the Spirit, as also from His Mother and us."

This magnificent exposition will enable the reader to form some notion of the genius of S. John, for be it observed that it forms part of only one Chapter, and that, far from being the longest amongst the twenty-eight relating to the Incarnation, which are contained in the third book.

The fourth book treats in general, of the appropriation of

the salvation, offered to mankind in Christ; it is rather discursive in its distribution of subjects, starting with the Resurrection, and again recurring to certain points, rather supplementary to the third book, than belonging to any other subject common to the rest of the fourth. After eight sections devoted to consequences of the Incarnation, and terms relating to it, the fourth book proper opens with Faith and Baptism, Faith and the Cross, then of worshipping towards the East, then of the Holy Eucharist, of the genealogy of our Lord, the Holy Scriptures, Ikons, Saints, and their relics, and, towards the conclusion, various questions are answered against prevalent errors of the time; for instance, as to the cause of evil, against the Manichees, as to the Sabbath and Circumcision against the Jews, concerning Antichrist, and finally concerning the Resurrection of the Body.

We shall give a few translated extracts from this book; the first, relating to the effects of the Incarnation:—

"The Son of God assumed humanity, in order that He might confer upon man again, that for which He made him. For He made him after His own image, intelligent, and free of will; and after His likeness, that is, perfect in virtues, so far as man's nature admits of. For the following exist as characteristics of Divine Nature, namely—the being impartible, indivisible, unmixed, good, wise, just, free from all wickedness. He established man, then, in communion with Himself. For He made him with a view to his being incorruptible. By means of fellowship with Himself, He brought him back to an incorruptible state. But when, through transgression of the commandment, we darkened and confounded the character of the Divine image, and through being involved in wickedness, had become denuded of the divine fellowship (for *what communion hath light with darkness?*) and being exiled from life, had become subject to the corruption of death; when He had made us partakers of the better, and we took no care of it, then He assumes the worse, I mean our nature, in order that, by Him, and in Himself, He might renew what was according to His image, and after His likeness, and might teach us also a virtuous conversation. When He had, by Himself, made this easy of attainment to us, and by the communication of life, had freed us from corruption, becoming the first-fruits of our resurrection; He repaired the useless and broken vessel, that He might ransom us from the tyranny of the devil, and call us to a knowledge of God, and might strengthen and instruct us, by patience and humility, to overthrow the tyrant. Then, indeed, the worship of devils ceased, the creature was

sanctified by the Divine Blood, altars and temples of idols were destroyed, Divine knowledge was planted in, the consubstantial Trinity, the uncreated Godhead, was worshipped, one true God, Creator of all, and Lord. Virtues are administered, a hope of resurrection through the resurrection of Christ is bestowed; devils are frighted at man, long time subject to them; and, what is wonderful, all these things have been rectified by the Cross and passion and death. Throughout all the world, the Gospel of Divine knowledge is preached, not by war, and arms, and camps putting to flight the adversaries; but a few defenceless, poor, unlearned men, persecuted, despitefully intreated, delivered unto death, preaching Him who was crucified in the flesh and died, prevailed over the wise and powerful. For the Almighty power of the Crucified followed them. Death, long-time so very terrible, is defeated, and though aforetime, detested and abhorred, is now preferred to life. These are the successful results of Christ's coming into the world, these are the tokens of His power. For not, as by Moses, has He saved one people out of Egypt, and from Pharaoh's bondage, and divided the sea for them—but rather He has rescued the whole human race from the corruption of death and the bitter tyranny of sin, not forcibly dragging them to virtue; not burying in the earth, nor burning up with fire, the sinners, and ordering them to be stoned; but by mildness, and long-suffering, persuading men to choose virtue, and to engage in, and be delighted with, labours in its behalf. For long time those who sinned were hardly intreated, and yet still continued to sin, and God imputed their sin to them. But now, for the sake of piety and virtue, they choose injurious treatment, and tortures, and death. Glory to Thee, O Christ, Word of God, Wisdom and Power, God Omnipotent. What shall we, who were destitute of all these blessings, render to Thee in return for them, for all things are Thine? And Thou requirest nothing more from us than to be saved, and this Thou Thyself givest. And Thou receivest, whilst conferring grace, through unutterable goodness. Thanks be to Thee, Who hast given us being, and hast graciously bestowed upon us well-being, and hast brought us up again to that from which we had fallen, through Thine unspeakable condescension!"

It will be observed how this passage continues the idea which pervades the previous extract, and how the same elevation of thought is carried on through both. The same remark is applicable to the two following passages; the

first, from the chapter on Baptism; the second, on the Eucharist:—

"Seeing that God formed us for incorruption, but, when we had transgressed His saving commandment, sentenced us to the corruption of death; in order that the evil might not be immortal, after He had descended among His servants, as being compassionately disposed towards them, and was made like us, and had redeemed us from corruption by His own Passion, He opened for us a fountain of remission out of His own holy and undefiled side, that is to say, water for the regeneration and ablution of sin and corruption—blood, the potion introductive of life eternal. He gave us too commandment to be regenerated by water and the Spirit, the Holy Spirit coming upon the water through prayer and invocation. For, seeing man is of a twofold constitution (of soul and body, that is,) He bestowed upon us likewise a twofold purification, namely, of water and of the Spirit — the Spirit for the renewing in us of the image and likeness—the water by the grace of the Spirit, for the cleansing of the body from sin, and the taking away of corruption. And whilst the water, on the one hand, fills up the image of death, the Spirit bestows, on the other, the earnest of life. For from the beginning the Spirit of God brooded over the water, and from the first, the Scripture testifies of the water, that it is a means of purification. * * * * The remission of sins, then, is bestowed upon all alike through Baptism; but the grace of the Spirit according to the proportion of faith, and of previous purification. * * * * Oil is received in Baptism, signifying our unction, and making us anointed persons (Christs) even the oil promised us of God by the Holy Spirit. Because also the olive-branch was brought to those who were saved by the flood.

"Seeing we are a kind of double and compound beings, it is but fitting that our nativity should be twofold, as also our sustenance compound. There is given us then the birth of water and the Spirit, I speak, of course, of holy Baptism. But the very Bread of life, our Lord Jesus Christ, Who came down from heaven, is the Food."

He then describes the Institution of the Eucharist, and, having shown how the power of God was adequate to effect a transmutation of the bread, and wine, and water, into His own Flesh and Blood, he continues,—

"The Body is that Body, truly united to the Divinity, which was from the holy Virgin, not because that very Body which

was taken up descends from heaven; but because the very bread and wine are transmade into the Body and Blood of God. But if thou inquirest the manner in which this takes place, suffice it thee to hear that it is by the Holy Spirit, just as by the Holy Spirit the Lord took for Himself, and in Himself, flesh of the holy God-Mother. And we know nothing more than that the Word of God is true, and powerful, and almighty; but as to the mode, it is inscrutable. It is allowable also to say this; that like as bread by being eaten, and wine and water by being drunk, are naturally converted into the body and blood of the person that eats and drinks them, and becomes another body from its former body; so the bread of prothesis, as well as the wine and water, by means of the invocation and coming upon them of the Holy Ghost, are supernaturally transmade into the Body and Blood of Christ, and are not two, but one and the same."

We have given these rather lengthy extracts with the less hesitation, since, strange to say, this invaluable work has never yet appeared in English; the time has now surely arrived when a translation of it has become almost necessary. We have here said enough to show how great is the authority due to all the works of S. John, coming to us as they do with the unanimous approval of the individual Church. Further remarks upon his works we must reserve for a future occasion.

S.

SIGNS AND WONDERS OF THE LATTER DAYS.

ART. X.—1. *Prælectiones Theologicæ de Virtute Religionis deque Vitiis Oppositis nominatim vero de Mesmerismi, Sonnambulismi ac Spiritismi recentiori Superstitione.* Auctore J. PERRONE, S. J., in Collegio Romano Studiosum Præfecto. Ratisbonæ, 1866.

2. *The Spiritual Magazine.* New Series. London: J. Caudwell, 1867-1868.

3. *What Spiritualism has Taught.* By WILLIAM HOWITT. London: Thomas Scott, Warwick Court, Holborn, 1865.

4. *Demonologia.* By J. S. F. London: Bumpus, 1825.

5. *The Breath of God with Man: An Essay on the Grounds and Evidences of Universal Religion.* By THOMAS LAKE HARRIS. London and New York. 1867.

6. *Pneumatologie. Des Esprits et leurs Manifestations diverses.* Par J. E. DE MIRVILLE, 4 tomes. Deuxième Edition. Paris: H. Vrayet de Surcy. 1863.

7. *La Magic du Dix-neuvième Siècle:* Ses Agents, ses Verités, ses Mensonges. Par le Chevalier GOUGENOT DES MOUSSEAUX. Paris: H. Plon. 1861.

8. *Strange Things amongst Us.* By H. SPICER. London: Chapman and Hall, 1863.

WHEN, in a country where for at least twelve centuries the Christian religion has been accepted, and by which that country has received unknown blessings both temporal and spiritual, schools of thought arise, in which Christianity is not simply patronized, but put out of court, the phenomenon is not only portentous, but noteworthy. That this is so at the present time in England, we need scarcely stay to point out. The scepticism which has deluged the Continent, coming upon a people whose religious convictions had been so seriously disturbed by the Reformation, and whose conceptions of political truth had been so ruthlessly disorganized by the events of the Commonwealth and the revolution of Dutch William, has found the ground well prepared for a scattering of the seeds of doubt. Abroad they were sown some generations ago, and brought forth deadly fruit. Events before our eyes tell in very plain language that our own turn has at last come. The day of trial is now upon us. True, the vulgarity of eighteenth-century unbelievers is not at present so manifestly apparent,

though it exists amongst those of the lower classes with whom scepticism is popular. But the tone and temper of Public Opinion, the bold utterances of serials and newspapers, the public policy of the House of Commons, the too general understanding that Christianity is to be as far as possible ignored in legislation—all indicate the steady and rapid progress of sceptical Liberalism.

The so-called Broad Church party, more or less, has done much, and will no doubt do much more, to eliminate the Supernatural from the minds of its admirers and of the people of England. Disliking dogma; its teaching, when the fog which surrounds it allows that teaching to be partly comprehended, is of the earth earthy. It dovetails in with the low material views and carnal desires of the money-grubbing many. Its ideal of bliss, not always wrapped up in philosophical jargon, and therefore sometimes intelligible, is simply commercial prosperity and temporal wealth; eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, material pleasure and ease; the conquest of Nature by scientific research and progress, an enjoyment of the Present and only the Present; and a complete banishment of the old-world theology—useful it may have been in times gone by, when the World was being educated, but now to be thrown aside as lumber, worn out and valueless. In place of Christianity as delivered at Pentecost, brought to England by Augustine and taught by Bede, Anselm, More, and Laud, we are promised doubt, disbelief, a refined as well as an unrefined intellectual Paganism, and in the end—though such an end may not now be contemplated by all Broad Churchmen—a positive rejection of the distinct nature of God.

At present, of course, the figure is decently draped. Its ugly proportions and hateful outline are not apparent. Its admirers have to accommodate themselves with some skill to the prejudices of the age; to tolerate systems which they contemn, to carry out the silent but certain operation of destruction, under the hypocritical desire to assist mankind in completing the work of temporal progress.

All this is before us and around us, if we would but note it. And this being so, the state of thought and of society is eminently calculated to afford those who disbelieve in the Supernatural, good opportunities of advance in the direction of negations. On the other hand, the presence amongst us of a sect of persons who call themselves "Spiritualists," and whose notorious words and works may be noted and criticised, is full of moment and importance. Spiritualism when first it

appeared and took shape was treated with contempt. The facts urged by its supporters were denied, the manifestations almost universally disbelieved in. It was declared to be the work of acute knaves or the offspring of idle and imaginative dreamers. Newspaper writers treated it with scornful contempt. Reports of its strange proceedings and extraordinary developments were knowingly and deliberately suppressed. It was hastily hustled off the public stage, refused a hearing and denied a defence. This policy, however convenient to its promoters, has failed. Spiritualism is amongst us still, more potent than ever. Sneers have not killed it! Its ideas and theories have been recently reduced to a formal system, while its votaries have increased to an extent scarcely credited—Christians and non-Christians, Catholics and Protestants, have ranged themselves under its banner, and accept and diffuse its views. To ourselves the existence of spurious coin proves the value of the true, and the portents of these latter times are surely full of warning and value.

At all periods, it should be observed, certain classes of the leaders of men's thoughts have succeeded in banishing the Supernatural from the field of human action. For example, Thucydides, representing the world in its exclusively natural aspect, did this. He had neither ear nor eye for the marvellous. In recent times, from the period of Locke to the beginning of the present century, a similar course was adopted by a very influential school of writers—remarkable for their careful dismissal of the miraculous both from ken and consideration. To such the World was a machine wound up once for all by its Author, and needing no further application of that power which appeared to have spent itself, so to speak, in the act of creation. Like S. Peter's "scoffers" "walking after their own lusts," they practically declared, "Since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation."

But, of course, such a state of thought could only be transitory. The universal convictions of man's conscience and the most earnest desires of his heart produced a reversion of opinion. The very dogmatic philosophers soon found themselves at sea. Reason and Imagination were starved while the Understanding was profoundly flattered. This has so turned out, not once, nor twice, but continually. Sceptism has followed superstition, and superstition sceptism. Wherever the Catholic Religion, having once been had, has been deliberately cast out and denied, there—as in Scotland at the present day—superstition is more than ordinarily wide-spread

and rampant. The Gnosticism and Manichæism of the early Christian era have reproduced themselves in later times; while Materialism has lived side by side with that superstition which, on the surface, it seemed so necessary for the same Materialism to deny.

We borrow the following faithful record of the rise of the modern system of spiritualism from a contemporary :—

"In December, 1847, a respectable farmer and his family, named Fox, settled in a house at Hydesville, a hamlet near Newark, in the State of New York. They were troubled from the first with noises, which in January, 1848, assumed the definite character of knockings, like that of a hammer. Two children, since so famous as the Misses Fox, felt something heavy, like a dog, lie on their feet when in bed, and one of them felt as if a cold hand were passed over her face. The knockings went on increasing in violence, and at length it was observed, on some occasion when Farmer Fox tried the windows to see if they could be caused by the wind, that the knockings exactly answered the rattle accidentally made by the moving sash. This suggested the idea of inviting the noises, or rather the beings who caused them, to reply by rapping, on repetition of the letters of the alphabet, to questions put to them. This was first tried at a place called Rochester, with which the family were connected, whence the term 'Rochester knockings' came into use. The experiment succeeded perfectly, and this was the origin of 'spirit-rapping,' which has since grown into a regular system. The neighbours being called in, the affair soon thickened and developed into a 'movement.' The rappings revealed a murder which had taken place in the house when in other hands. Public meetings were called, committees of ladies formed to examine the children, and prevent the possibility of deception. Similar phenomena began to show themselves in various parts of the country, and under yet more extraordinary conditions. Raps were heard on all sorts of objects,—ceilings, tables, chairs, &c., and it was discovered that certain persons were better fitted than others to communicate with the spirits, to whom these noises were now attributed. Such persons were called *mediums*, a name with which the world is now sufficiently familiar, and when they were present tables and chairs would move about and rise from the ground. Many other astonishing things became common, as drawing and music executed under this strange influence by persons who knew nothing of these arts."

The acts and deeds of Mr. Daniel Home, a Scotchman, and of the Davenport brothers, Americans, who figure very prominently as mediums in the authentic records of the spiritualists, are tolerably well known by report to many of our

readers. From America, where the signs were first noticed, they came eastwards to England and the European Continent, in which places the spiritual manifestations were even more remarkable than those which had occurred and been testified to in the West. Under the direction of a "medium" people sat round a table, and by a silent invocation of spirits, by "willing" * that they should come, they came, and produced the following amongst other equally strange phenomena. Large tables rose to the ceiling, floating in the atmosphere with a sort of undulating motion, and coming down again to the floor without noise—sprigs of flowers were torn off and presented to people by the spirits. Accordions and other musical instruments were played without any visible hand holding or moving them. Luminous stars and streaks of light appeared in various places, while "spirit hands" were seen and felt as palpably as mortal flesh and blood could be. Answers to questions made, were given by a system of raps or by spelling out words on a child's alphabet placed on the floor. Thus conversations, sometimes sensible, but frequently trivial and absurd, were held with the spirits summoned. Spirit hands, using material pens, ink, and paper, wrote answers to queries; quoted verses from known authors; or put down original poems. In some cases the narratives published were anonymous, and only authenticated by witnesses who privately testified to the newspaper editors of their accuracy. But in some instances persons of repute and ability came forward in support of their correctness. Dr. Gully of Malvern, for example, publicly testified that he had seen Mr. Home float about a room for several minutes, and guaranteed the accuracy of the facts set forth in a most remarkable fashion in an early number of the *Cornhill Magazine*. A well-known clergyman of the Catholic party in the Church of England gives his testimony to the truth and strangeness of certain appearances and manifestations in the following communication to the writer of this paper:—

"I was staying in the north of England with the Rev. —— in 1850. During my visit a well-known medium (a clergyman at that period of the diocese of London), spent the evening with us. Eight or ten other people were there at the same time. 'Table turning' was the subject of a long and animated discussion, in which those who accepted the facts and those who rejected them were about equally divided. There was nothing to do, therefore, but to test the question. This was done. A

* The term "willer" and "necromancer" are used as identica by Easterns as well as by the aborgines of New Zealand.

circular table about four feet in diameter, of considerable size and weight, was used. Seven people sat round it, joined their hands on the table, and after conjointly *willing* that it should turn itself in one direction or be turned, for about twelve minutes, it began to vibrate strangely and then slowly to move. At first its motion was in circles; then it moved from side to side of the room with dash and rapidity. Afterwards it was strangely tilted up on one side, remaining in that position for a while, and then it was tilted on the other side. On one occasion later on it rose several inches from the ground and remained suspended in the air for nearly two minutes. As to the facts, no one could dispute them. Afterwards a variety of questions were put, to which the table replied by knocking on the floor. It was agreed beforehand that one knock should stand for 'No,' two for 'Yes.' An alphabet was produced, and words in response were spelled out. Some of the queries were trivial, some arithmetical, some theological, some momentous. The answers were usually accurate, sensible, and intelligible, but not always so. After questions had been put concerning the future state, heaven, hell, purgatory, the happiness of the good and the punishment of the wicked, a question was asked, 'Where did the spirit now answering dwell when on earth?' The name of a place in Devonshire was spelled out. This reply greatly interested a clergyman present who some fifteen years previously had been curate in that county. It was followed up by another:—'What was the name of the person whose spirit is here?' Then the table spelt out, by means of the alphabet, the name of a yeoman who had died impenitent and blaspheming at the period before referred to. This was sufficient for me," writes our correspondent: "what I had seen and heard convinced me that necromancy was practised. I left the house, protecting myself by the sacred sign, convinced of the sin of the practice. And though I had been a spectator and not an actor, made a resolution, which I have scrupulously kept, never to see nor sanction such proceedings again."

From another source, a well-known country gentleman in one of the Midland counties, we have obtained a series of questions and answers which were put, given and taken down, in the year 1856, at a gathering at which the practice of table-turning and spirit invocation was tested by those whose conviction, in the main, regarding them, as we are informed, agrees with that of our correspondent previously quoted. Similar strange phenomena occurred on this occasion likewise:—

"Are you a Spirit who inhabited this earth? Yes.
How long have you been dead? No reply.
Have you been dead years? No.

Months? No.
Weeks? No.
Days? Yes.
How many? Five days.
Do you mean five days? Yes.
Did you live in this neighbourhood? Yes.
Did you know any at this table? Yes.
Will you point them out? Yes. (It then crossed the room three times violently and stopped before three persons.)
Will you spell your name? Yes. R—— J——. (The way he always spelt it.)
Are you happy? No answer.
Can we do you any good? No.
Was the Baptist religion true? No.
Will you spell the true religion? Yes. Saients.
Is there a middle state of souls? Yes.
Will the end of the world* be soon? Yes.
Will it be the end of the world or the end of wickedness? The end of wickedness? Yes.
Will the world be destroyed by water? No.
By fire? No.
Will it be partly destroyed by fire? Yes.
Shall any of us see the Last Day? Yes.
In how many years? Twenty-five years.
Will the last judgment be then? No.
Will that be the Millennium? Yes.
Will Enoch and Elijah come again? Yes.
Will the Jews be restored? Yes.
Will Russia conquer England? Yes.
Will it be in the reign of Queen Victoria? No.
In the reign of her successor? Yes.
Will Russia conquer France? Yes.
Will Napoleon be conquered by Russia? Yes.
Will Russia conquer Austria? No.
Will it conquer Rome? Yes.
Will it then become orthodox? Yes.
Is it orthodox now? No.
Will there be a persecution of Catholics in England? Yes.
Will England become Catholic again? Yes."

More recently the manifestations have been developed. From a recent part of the *Spiritual Magazine* we quote the following:—

"The *séance* was held by appointment. Our object being that of investigation, we limited the number to three, and I

* This person, whose name was most accurately given, had died five days previously. He had belonged to the sect of the Anabaptists.

must add used every precaution we could think of to preclude the possibility of self-deception; we likewise guarded against any possible preparatory arrangement. Accordingly we changed from the library to the dining-room. We were soon seated at a heavy square table. Twenty minutes passed without any manifestation; then came gentle raps, followed by the table being lifted, tilted, and gently vibrated. Then raps were heard simultaneously in different and opposite parts of the room. At my suggestion the lamp was partly turned down, when a cold current of air was felt to pass over our hands and faces. A pause ensued. The dining-room table-leaf standing in the corner of the room then commenced to vibrate, and one of the leaves being taken from the stand was passed between Mr. Home and the table at which we were seated. It was then raised straight up and passing vertically over my friend, gently touched him; in passing over me it struck me on the crown of the head, but so gently that I could hardly realize it to be the heavy leaf of the dining-room table; the touch nevertheless caused the leaf to vibrate all but sonorously. I name this to prove how delicately balanced and suspended in the air the leaf of the table must have been to have produced the vibration. It then passed over to the right, touching my shoulders, and finally was placed upon the table at which we were seated. The distance the leaf was carried I compute at nearly twelve yards (allowing for the circuit made) and at an elevation of six feet. A small round table was then moved from the corner of the room, and placed next to my friend, and in reply to his question *who it was*, he received the answer, audible to us all, '*Pa'—Pa', dear—darling Pa'*.' An arm-chair behind my friend, and at a distance of three yards, was raised up straight into the air, carried over our heads, and placed upon the dining-room table to my left—a voice clearly and loudly repeating the words, 'Papa's chair.' We then observed the wooden box of the accordion being carried from the extreme corner of the room, up to my friend. In passing my right hand, I passed my hand under and over the box, as it travelled suspended in the air to my front. I did this to make sure of the fact of its being moved by an invisible agency, and not by means of mechanical aid. . . . . The accordion was then taken from Mr. Home, carried about in the room, and played. Voices were distinctly heard; a low whispering, and voices imitating the break of a wave on the shore. Finally the accordion placed itself upon the table we were seated at, and two luminous hands were distinctly seen resting on the keys of the instrument. They remained luminously visible for from twenty to thirty seconds, and then melted away. I had in the meantime, and at the request of my friend, taken hold of the accordion; whilst so held by me, an invisible hand laid hold of the instrument and played for two or three minutes

what appeared to me to be sacred music. Voices were then heard, a kind of murmuring or low whistling and breathing; at times in imitation of the murmur of the waves of the sea, at other times more plaintively melodious. The accordion was then a second time taken by an invisible power, carried over our heads, and a small piece of sacred music played—then a hymn—voices in deep sonorous notes singing the hallelujah. I thought I could make out three voices, but my friend said he could speak to four. A jet of light then crossed the room, after which a star or brilliantly luminous disk, followed by the appearance of a softly luminous column of light, which moved up between me and my friend. I cannot say that I could discern any distinct outline. The luminous column appeared to me to be about five to six feet high, the subdued soft light mounting from it half illumining the room. The column or luminous appearance then passed to my right; and a chair was moved and placed next to me. I distinctly heard the rustling as of a silk dress. Instinctively I put my hand forward to ascertain the presence of the guest, when a soft hand seized my hand and wrist. I then felt that the skirt of a dress had covered my knees. I grasped it; it felt like thick silk, and melted away as I firmly clenched my hand on it. By this time I admit I shuddered. A heavy footstep then passed to my right, the floor vibrating to the footfall; the spirit-form now walked up to the fireplace, clapping its hands as it passed me. I then felt something press against the back of my chair; the weight was so great that as the form leaned on my shoulder I had to bend forward under the pressure. Two hands gently pressed my forehead,—I noticed a luminous appearance at my right; I was kissed, and what to me at the time made my very frame thrill again, spoken to in a sweet, low, melodious voice. The words uttered by the spirit were distinctly heard by all present. As the spirit-form passed away, it repeated the words, 'I kissed you, I kissed you,' and I felt three taps on each shoulder, audible to all present, as if in parting to reimpress me with the reality of its presence. I shuddered again, and in spite of all my heroism, felt very 'uncanny.' My friend now called our attention to his being patted by a soft hand on his head. I heard a kiss, and then the words, 'Papa, dear papa.' He said his left hand was being kissed, and that a soft child-like hand was caressing him. A cloud of light appeared to be standing at his left."

Another example, from the same publication, deserves to be put on record:—

"The first group of the manifestations (I use the term 'group' to mark the characteristic difference of the phenomena on each occasion) occurred at a friend's house at Great Malvern.

Those present had only incidentally met, and owing to a prohibition being laid upon Mr. Home by his medical man against trying his strength, no *séance* was attempted. I name this as characteristic. Raps in different parts of the room, and the movement of the furniture, however, soon told of the presence of the invisibles. The library in which the party had met communicated with the hall, and the door having been left half open, a broad stream of light from the burners of the gas-lamp lit up the room. At the suggestion of one of the party, the candles were removed. The rapping which had till then been heard in different parts of the room, suddenly made a pause, and then the unusual phenomenon of the appearance of spirit-forms manifested itself. The opening of the half-closed door was suddenly darkened by an invisible agency, the room becoming pitch dark. Then the wall opposite became illumined, the library now being lit up by a luminous element, for it cannot be described otherwise. Between those present and the opposite and now illumined wall two spirit-forms were seen, their shadowy outline on the wall well defined. The forms moved to and fro. They made an effort to speak; the articulation, however, was too imperfect to permit of the meaning of the words being understood. The darkening which had obscured the half-closed door was then removed, and the broad light from the hall-lamp reappeared, looking quite dim in comparison with the luminous brilliancy of the light that had passed away. Again the room became darkened, then illumined, and a colossal head and shoulders appeared to rise from the floor, visible only by the shadow it cast upon the illumined wall. What added to the interest was the apparent darkening and lighting up of the room at will, and that repeatedly, the library door remaining half open all the while. The time occupied by these phenomena was perhaps five to ten minutes, the manifestations terminating quite abruptly."

A correspondent of the same serial gives the following facts:—

"On the 1st October, 1865, I attended a *séance* at 13, Victoria Place, Clifton, where the younger Mrs. Marshall, the well-known medium, from London, was staying. I had previously prepared, as a test, a series of written questions inserted in a book and numbered consecutively; my wife, who was present, was, by the usual method, put in communication with the spirit of her mother, and the following are a few of the results: it is important to observe that no clue was given to the medium, or to others present, as to the nature of the answers required, the questions being put in the following form:—'Will you answer the question number 33?' &c., and as the answers were occasionally given in a different form from what was anticipated,

though still quite correctly; these two facts taken together, conclusively prove, as it appears to me, that the answers were neither the result of any knowledge on the part of the medium, nor any 'reflex action' from the mind of the interrogator.

"The spirit having been requested to answer the question numbered 33, *viz.*:—'Will you spell the name of the place where we lived when you left this state?' The reply, spelt through the alphabet, was 'Aust.'

"*Question No.* 34 having been put in the same manner, *viz.*:—'Where was your body buried?' The reply was, 'Saint George's.'

"*No.* 35.—'While your body was lying in the coffin, was anything put in the hand?'* *Reply*, 'Yes.'

"*No.* 36.—'What was it?' *Reply*, 'A sprig of myrtle.'

"*No.* 37.—'By whom was it put there?' *Reply*, 'Thomas Bowman.'

"*No.* 38.—'Who else were present at the time?' *Reply*, 'Ann Tommy and Mary Bowman Bryant.'

"Many other replies were given, of an equally satisfactory character, but I must not further trespass on your space. I would merely remark that the answers, in each case, were quite correct, and that the events referred to occurred upwards of forty years since."

Again: Mr. James Howell, of 7, Guildford Road, Brighton, writes thus in the *Spiritual Magazine* for November, 1867:—

"When I was at the Marshalls' last summer, a circumstance, unknown to any one present save myself, was made known to me by unaccountable means. The name of a young lady who suffered and died from spinal complaint in the year 1843 was correctly spelled out, and the date of her death given. I was most intimately acquainted with her. She was good, pious, and highly intellectual. To her I owe my knowledge of the French language, and my love of its literature. I was not thinking of her at the time; in fact, she was furthest from my thoughts; yet her name—a very uncommon one, you will admit,—was given correctly, 'Aletta V——.' Now, I am honest enough to confess that a million guesses would not have guessed that name. I was astounded and affected; for it brought back to my mind a rush of thoughts, happy and sad, of those evenings when I sat by her bedside listening to her

* "The reader who has not been in the habit of attending *séances* should be informed that the peculiar phraseology of some of the questions is rendered necessary by the fact that if you ask the spirits 'Where did *you* die?' or 'Where were *you* buried?' they will sometimes tell you that it was not *they* who died and were buried, but merely the external shell or material covering of the real man."—Note by the Editor of the *Spiritual Magazine*.

sweet voice, and imbibing the original thoughts which sprang, not only from a well-stored mind, but one instinct with genius. Twenty-three years had elapsed from the time of her death; she had often promised to communicate with me from the spirit world, if it was possible; and now that promise was fulfilled, even in the presence of others."

And, once more, the same writer gives the following record of facts:—

"I paid a visit, Monday, July 2nd, to Mrs. Parks, of Cornwall Terrace, Regent's Park, then staying at 7, Bedford Square. Miss Purcell, the medium, went with me; and we three had some strong and wonderful manifestations. The table turned about merrily, and once whirled round in mid-air. It became as animated as a living being; it even ran about when not a single being touched it. Knockings were heard all over the room, in chairs, upon tables, under the floor, and along the wainscot. We had great trouble to keep the tables from being smashed. During the evening, the 'Blue Bells of Scotland,' and 'Marlbro's *en-va-t-en guerre*,' were knocked out on the table in a beautiful and correct manner: the table beating and dancing admirable time to each tune. At a previous *séance*, a well-known tune was knocked out, and my wife was requested to dance, the spirits stating the table should accompany her; but as we could not induce her to do so, we lost the promised *pas de deux* between a human being and a table. At my request the table also gave a series of knocks, *viz.*, the footman's, the postman's, the tax-gatherer's and the countryman's, which were perfect, and caused us much amusement. In one part of the room there appeared a silvery blueish star, shining brilliantly. Mrs. Parks, strange to say could not see it; but to the medium and myself it was clearly visible, at the same time too; and a brilliant member of the stellar creation it was, coming and going like those of the sky when for a moment a veil of clouds passes over them."

The conviction that such acts and deeds are the work of evil spirits is put on record in the same serial, in the following narrative:—

"Mr. and Mrs. C—— attend a *séance* at which the spirit of 'a darling child' is manifestly present. They attend a second *séance*, and, through the same medium, they are confirmed in the conviction of the real presence of their child. Mr. C—— then finds that he is himself a medium, and, forthwith, he purchases a small table for the exercise of his power.

"His first experiment proves to him beyond a doubt that an intelligent being, though invisible, is with him; but he speedily begins to suspect that whatever the character may

have been of the spirit which first manifested to him through another medium, this, which is now communicating through himself, is an evil spirit. On his 'wishing it to walk to the dining-room, it started at once.' He was struck by its heavy tread, 'so very unlike the footfalls of a young child,' and he exclaimed, 'This is *not* the spirit of my child, if so I want no other manifestation.' Becoming more and more suspicious of the character of this particular visitant, he said, 'If thou art not the spirit of my child, march out of the house.' 'The table did, indeed, march, making a noise like the loud and well-measured footfalls of a heavy dragoon—literally shaking everything in the room.'

"This gentleman then adjured the spirit in a variety of forms, and asked if it was not a bad spirit? and it said, 'Yes!' Then he said, 'Accursed devil! by the living God I adjure thee to speak the truth! Has the spirit of my child *ever* been put in communication with myself or her mother through this or any other table?' The 'accursed devil' said, 'No, never!' Then, after similar assurances, Mr. C—— made up his mind to believe the devil; and he closed his experiments with an auto-da-fé, by breaking up and burning the table!"

We obtain from these extracts—which might be multiplied thirty-fold from the authorized publications of the spiritualists—some idea of the nature of their *séances* and proceedings. Our own statement at the outset has been more than justified as regards its moderation and accuracy from the examples provided in the extracts in question. "Necromancy" has been well-defined to be "The art of communicating with devils and of doing surprising things by means of their aid; particularly that of calling up the dead and extorting answers from them." Now this, it seems to us, in one form or another, is precisely that which is now carried on by a considerable section of people in England and elsewhere. It is practised mainly by persons who were such extreme Protestants in previous times that, having almost altogether denied the Supernatural, they have been reluctantly won over to a belief in it by communion with evil spirits. Father Perrone, the Jesuit, has calculated that upwards of two thousand treatises have been published in defence of the system of these manifestations during the past fifteen years. It has been pointedly remarked by an English clergyman, of the people who once, like the the ancient Sadducees, rejected the idea of the existence of spirits, but who now have accepted the Spiritualistic theory, that "they have given up believing in nothing and have taken to believe in the devil." And the saying is hardly too pointed. According to Perrone, the modern professors of divination

frankly allow that the phenomena have passed through three phases. First, that of Mesmerism; secondly, artificial Somnambulism and Clairvoyance; and thirdly, Spiritualism, properly so-called. He gives five reasons for maintaining his theory of diabolical agency with regard to the same. 1. From the nature of the phenomena. 2. From the effects. 3. From the manner in which Mesmerism operates. 4. From the malice and wickedness of the agent, who frequently utters antichristian and blasphemous doctrines; and lastly, 5, from the admission of the mediums or operators themselves.

In most cases it may be safely assumed that evil spirits personify the souls of the departed. That such spirits are the deadly foes of man so long as he is in his period of probation may, for all Catholic Christians, be also assumed. That such spirits, moreover, constantly represent the departed as continually desiring the hand of death to fall upon their earthly friends, in order, as is implied or stated, that a future of unclouded light and everlasting happiness may speedily link them together, can be seen from a careful study of the records of Spiritualism. Some of the facts already set forth teach this. The principle that all men, whether good or bad, righteous or unrighteous, will be certainly saved and be for ever hereafter in bliss, is the practical heresy that Spiritualism in its theological aspect has most openly taught, and still continues to teach.

"Spiritualism," writes Mr. William Howitt, a convert to it from Quakerism, "rejects the doctrine of eternal damnation as alike injurious to God and man. Injurious to God's noblest attributes, repugnant to the principles of justice, and unavailing in men as a motive to repentance. . . . Spiritualism knows that there are isolated passages in the Gospels and in the words of our Saviour capable of being made to bear an appearance favouring the doctrine of eternal punishments, but it knows that the original terms bear no such latitude, and when Christ says that there is a state 'where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched,' it admits the state, but denies that any of God's creatures will continue in that state a minute longer than is necessary to purge the foulness of sin and the love of sin out of their spiritual constitutions. Were the solution of this supposed difficulty much harder than it is, Spiritualism would place the love of God and the love of Christ, and all the great and gracious attributes of God and his Saviour—justice and truth and wisdom, and a charity more immeasurable than God himself recommends to mankind, confidently and courageously against so horrible and senseless a doctrine."

Now, though Spiritualism be ignored by the press, Universalism, its own offspring, is constantly and persistently maintained.

Spiritualism also flatly denies the great Christian doctrine of the Resurrection of the body:—

"Spiritualism teaches, on the authority of Scripture and of all spirit-life, that there is no such thing as death; it is but a name given to the issue of the soul from the body. To those in bodies who witness this change the spirit is invisible, and they only see a body which ceases all its living functions, has lost that intelligence which during so-called life emanated from it, and lies stiff and cold and to all appearance dead. But even the body is not dead. There is a law of life even in what is called dead matter, which is perpetually changing its particles and converting them into mere black earth and water, and hence into all the articles necessary for the physical life—corn, meat, wine, all foods, all fruits. The same law immediately begins to operate in the dead body, and, if unobstructed, speedily resolves it back into earth, and then forms this again into food and clothing and fresh enveloping forms for fresh human beings. The whole of the universe is in perpetual action, and the ever-revolving wheel of physical is subserving the perpetual evolution of spiritual life."*

And again—

"The Church of England and Spiritualism accord, but not in the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. The spirits all assert with St. Paul, that the body which rises from the death-bed is the spiritual body, and that the soul needs no other, much less an earthly body, in its spirit-home—that, in fact, nothing of the earth can ever enter heaven. That if the spirits of just men are *made perfect*, they can be made nothing more, and no addition of anything belonging to this earth can add to their happiness, freedom, power, and perfection, but on the contrary. That so far from receiving at some indefinite and probably very distant period, their earthly bodies back again, they are continually, as they advance, casting off the subtler particles of matter that have interpenetrated their spiritual bodies."†

With regard to the influence of the Protestant Reformation on that temper of mind and habit of thought which have led sceptics and those whose faith has been overturned by the blasphemies of Calvin or the immoral principle of the Lutheran systems and their offshoots, to become votaries of Spiritualism, we cannot do better than put on record Mr. Howitt's deliberate

* Howitt's *What Spiritualism has taught*, p. 8.
† Ibid p. 10.

judgment, expressed in language which, however painful to read in some parts, is at once forcible and pertinent:—

"By the denial of the intermediate states, the Protestant Reformers perpetrated a more monstrous outrage on the Divine justice, and more frightfully libelled the Divine mercy, than by the broadest stretch of imagination one would have thought it possible. By this arbitrary extinction of some of the loveliest regions of creation, by this wiping out of vast kingdoms of God's tolerance and goodness by the sponge of Protestant reaction, God's whole being was blackened, and every one of His eternal attributes dislocated and driven pell-mell into the limbo of Atheism. I say Atheism, for such a God could not possibly exist as this Protestant theory would have made Him—a God with less justice than the most stupid country squire ever established in the chair of magistracy, with less mercy than an inquisitor or a torturer with his red-hot pinchers and iron boots. These atrocities were but the work of moments, but this system made the God of love and the Father of Jesus Christ sitting in endless bliss amid a favoured few, whilst below were incalculable populations suffering the tortures of fires which no period even of millions of years should extinguish, and that without any proportion whatever to the offences of the sufferers! All who were not 'spirits of just men made perfect' were, according to this doctrine, only admissible to this common hell, this common receptacle of the middling, bad, and the most bedevilled of devils! Never could any such monstrous, foul, and destable doctrine issue from any source but that of the hearts of fiends themselves. None but devils could breed up so black a fog of blasphemy to blot out the image of a loving and paternal God from the view of His creatures. And yet the mocking devil induced the zealous Protestant fathers to accept this most truly 'doctrine of devils,' as an antidote to Popish error. As some glimmering of the direst consequences of this shutting up of the middle states of the invisible world began to dawn on the Protestant mind, it set about to invent remedies and apply palliatives, and by a sort of spiritual hocus-pocus, it taught that if the greatest sinners did but call on Christ at the last gasp, they were converted into saints, and found themselves in heaven itself with God and the Lamb. This was only making the matter worse, and holding out a premium for the continuance in every sin and selfishness to the last moment. It was an awful temptation to self-deception presented to human selfishness. Millions, no doubt, have trusted to this wretched Protestant reed, and have found themselves in very dreary and uncomfortable circumstances, instead of in Abraham's bosom. Yet common sense in others rejected and rejects the cruel deceit. A country poet, writing the epitaph of the blacksmith in my native village, expressed the truth on the Protestant theory of no middle regions:—

'Too bad for heaven, too good for hell,
So where he's gone we cannot tell.'"

Here we must bring our imperfect and fragmentary remarks to a conclusion. To have discussed the facts and theories provided on previous pages, would have occupied a treatise. Sufficient, however, is before our readers to point out the true character of many of the Signs and Wonders which exist in this nineteenth century, and which testify and witness to old truths. The ministry of "men and of angels in a wonderful order," the practice of exorcism, diabolical agency, possession by evil spirits, the sins of witchcraft and necromancy, are all more or less intertwined with the Revelation which God has given to man. But the Materialism of these latter days is blinding men's eyes, that they cannot see, and destroying their faith in all that is beyond their temporal range. Intellectual Paganism, and a positive disbelief in the distinct nature of God, if not openly professed, is indirectly acknowledged, while the Faith of Pentecost, which for generations has regenerated the World, is cast aside as worn out, effete, and valueless. The possibility of miracle is derided: Providence is scouted as the fond dream of an exaggerated human self-love; belief in the power of prayer is asserted to be only a superstition, illustrative of man's ignorance of the scientific conception of law; the hypothesis of absolutely invariable law, and the cognate conception of Nature as a self-evolved system of self-existent forces and self-existent matter, are ideas advancing with giant strides. Side by side with all this, however, stand the portentous phenomena referred to here. Let the existence of one course of such facts as those related be granted, and far more follows than the pure Materialist or the Positivist would for a moment allow. Yet none can deny the presence amongst us of such, evil in their essence and mischievous in their operations. The whole cycle represent the works of the devil and his angels—works opposed at every step in theory by the truths of Christianity, and in fact by the sacraments of the Catholic Church. Man's highest and chiefest duty is to do the Will of the Most High: the practice of the Spiritualists, on the other hand (and let us lay the warning to heart), appears to be an intentional giving up their wills to the evil one, a "willing" for supernatural intervention in things which are unlawful, and a deliberate turning away from Him to Whom all power is given in Heaven and in Earth.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ORTHODOX DOCTRINE OF THE DEPARTED.

SIR,—It is so very desirable that the *Union Review* should supply a vehicle for the expression of opinion from the most opposite quarters of our divided Christendom, that I was extremely glad to see in your last number an elaborate dissertation from a member of the Eastern Church, signing himself "S.," "On Prayer for the Departed." But, as I cannot help feeling that he has handled the subject in a manner more adapted to multiply existing differences than to reconcile them, I trust you will allow me to offer a few comments on his—as it appears to me—very gratuitous attack on Catholic theology bearing on the subject. In the first place I may observe that the formal teaching of the Greek Church neither goes beyond nor falls short of our own. The Synod of Bethlehem does not, I believe, use the *word* Purgatory, but it defines in substance precisely what the Council of Trent defines, neither more nor less, "that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are assisted by the prayers of the faithful and the holy sacrifice." Nor is there anything in the present writer's summary of "orthodox doctrine," at the end of his paper, inconsistent with ours, except one negative assertion to which I will return presently. And next, I must observe that the Church is responsible for her own authorized and formal teaching, and for that alone. There may be, and in fact is, considerable variety of opinion among theologians on subordinate questions, such as most of those dealt with in this article. But no opinion, however prevalent, or whatever great names may be quoted in its defence, is binding on anybody to whose judgment it does not approve itself, or can therefore be any legitimate ground of separation. One further general remark I must add. "S." thinks it necessary to attack, not without considerable vehemence, several explanations suggested by Catholic divines of the practice of prayer for the dead. But he does not profess to offer any sort of explanation of his own, nor is any suggested in the sermon of Philaret, the late venerable Metropolitan of Moscow, whom he quotes at some length, beyond "the immemorial example of the Church of all ages." The usage of the Church, however, must be based on some good *reason*. If all the explanations hitherto put forward are inade-

quate or mistaken, we might fairly expect our critic—who strenuously defends the practice itself against Protestants—to supply a better explanation of his own. He can hardly wonder if Protestants demur to a practice, however ancient, for which no reason or meaning can be assigned.

To come to particulars, "S.'s" detailed criticism on St. Thomas will not detain us long. He first objects that the Orthodox (Greek) Church holds the separation of soul and body to be an impediment "to *final* retribution." So does every one, I presume, who accepts the Apostles' Creed; but he has wholly mistaken the great Dominican if he supposes him to imply the contrary. Then we are told that disembodied souls cannot suffer from "a corporeal fire." It is difficult, perhaps, to say with any certainty what disembodied souls can or cannot undergo. But it is quite enough to reply here that a corporeal fire, whether in purgatory or in hell, is no part of Catholic doctrine, but an entirely open question. As regards purgatory, it was expressly *rejected* from being made a doctrine at the Council of Florence. Lastly, it is laid down very dogmatically that in the next life there is no place for man to repent, or merit, or amend himself. This is rather a sweeping assertion again, though it happens to be in strict accordance with what most "Roman Catholics suppose," instead of being (as is implied) the reverse. But it is in direct and patent contradiction to a statement of Philaret's, quoted, with high approval, a few pages further on, where he speaks of "moral or spiritual benefit" being the object of prayer generally, and proceeds to apply this to the case of prayer for the departed, saying that if he has committed sin not unto death, "*it can give him life.*" (The italics are not mine.)

But then, adds "S." in conclusion, "we are nowhere told by the Church, in Scripture, in the Fathers, or in holy tradition, that there is any such thing as a purgatory or *status expiationis.*" To say nothing of the ineradicable instincts of natural religion, which have prompted some such belief in every thoughtful mind from Plato downwards, we have abundant intimations of it in the sacred authorities to which "S." refers. As to Scripture, the obvious bearing of the *locus classicus* on the subject, 1 Cor. iii. 11—15, will hardly be disposed of by the extravagant suggestion that "saved, so as by fire," does not mean saved in the ordinary sense of the word, but preserved alive for everlasting burning in hell!! As to the Fathers, I must not overload your paper with a string of extracts, but "S." will find plenty of evidence in Tract 90, or the "Tract on Purgatory" in the recent series of *Tracts for the Day*, of the conspicuous inaccuracy of his statement. It may suffice here to point to the well-known passage in S. Augustine *De Doctrina Christiana* on the subject.

I have purposely written as briefly and drily as possible,

and in no controversial spirit, for my aim is to reconcile those differences which a treatment like that of "S." can only exaggerate. He will not, I hope, be offended if I venture to refer him in conclusion to a little work, from which he may learn more of the idea and philosophy, so to speak, of purgatory than from many learned treatises. It is, indeed, a poem, but the poet is John Henry Newman, and from him neither Roman Catholic, Greek, nor Anglican need be ashamed to learn. The more carefully the "Dream of Gerontius" is studied and pondered, the better will the true idea of the middle state be understood and realised.

A Roman Catholic.

Feb. 7, 1868.

ORIGINAL POETRY.

THE ANGELUS.

The Angelus, the Angelus, the sound we love so well,
The triple-sounding call to praise, the thrice-recurring bell;
A voice it is, an Angel's voice, exhorting men to prayer,
That men the Incarnate Saviour's love abundantly may share.

It rings when half the world is still, ere night has passed away,
What time the murmur of the mass prevents the wintry day;
Tells from the snow-cap't tower that God a little child became,
To bear His day of Tempest here, His Agony and Shame.

O strange infatuation, see! the day-spring dawns so bright,
Yet sin-enshrouded sons of Eve shut out the glorious light;
The curtained chambers of their souls in death-like silence bound,
Admit no ray of Gospel-light, no angel-song resound.

Unwearied rings the Angelus in noontide's lingering hours,
Or when the vapid chills of eve fall round the minster towers,
For ever calling on the crowds that pass so restless by,—
Ere death shall seal their busy lips,—to send one prayer on high.

The ice binds many a stream to-night, the frozen falls are still,
But O, far worse the sin-numbed heart, the cold insensate will.
The earth is weak, and sleeps at peace, deep drugged with pleasure's cup,
One only is there found Whose strength can bear the pillars up.

How earnest was the dying prayer of Israel's sightless chief,
In asking vengeance—this alone, his heart could find relief;
But Christ, with outstretched arms sustains the world and all its wrong,
Lest judgment, when the pillars fall, should crush the hopeless throng.

Hush'd are the words of stern rebuke, love reigns where wrath has been,
No longer Eden's gate is closed, nor fiery sword is seen:
Stands bless'd a Woman of our race, a race through woman cursed,
For what is *Ave*, joyous word, but *Eva's* name reversed?

Then ring, thou Sacred Angelus, through generations on,
Say how profound the bleeding love of Mary's wounded Son!
Refresh our failing memory, stay earthward-tending thought,
Repeating day by day the words that happy Gabriel brought.

As when the rosy hues of morn lie faint on Alpine height,
And one by one the distant peaks rise to the enraptured sight;
Glows for a moment of delight that splendour far away,
Then with the sunrise all is lost in light of dazzling day:

So Mary, brightened by the rays of God's intensest love,
Receives that message wonderful, descending from above,
Then glorious to our gaze appears the Sun of Righteousness,
Glad with His new-born light and grace a darkened world to bless.

All hail, sweet Mother of the Man Who bore Himself our grief,
Sing we how His atoning Blood has brought our hearts relief;
Sing we, when earthly Angelus and earthly prayer be done,
His Love, amidst the Angel hosts, through countless ages on!

THOMAS, O. S. B.

SHELLEY.

I dreamed; and in my dream I saw
An Indian bird, whose golden throat
Was rich with every dulcet note,
Untaught by Art, unchecked by law.

The humming-birds and bulbuls still'd
Their minor cadences, whene'er
His warblings floated on the air,
And all the copse with rapture fill'd.

"How beautiful this fragrant grove!"
He sang. "How beautiful am I;
And these bright glimpses of blue sky,
Where clouds and stars alternate rove.

"By no supreme creator planned,
In beauty and in music all
The tenants of this gorgeous hall
In self-appointed order stand.

"Our hues and shapes, our varied powers
Of flight and song, our matchless grace
In crystal lymph, in air, or race,
Are gifts of none, but purely ours.

"At will we live, at will we die,
At will shall others come instead;
We are Life's brimful fountain-head,
And were so from eternity.

"The grasses spring, and in the sod
The breezes shed the old year's bloom;
Advancing tides the hills entomb;
And all (if God there be) is God—

"Self-made, self-poised, and boundless range,
Omnipotent e'en in decay,
A night including endless day,
Unchanging in continual change."

Now in my dream my soul was sad;
And, musing on the strain I heard,
I murmured, "Surely the strange bird,
So sweetly musical, is mad!

"Thou singest only to thy shame,
However deep thy plumes be dyed
In light. Who art thou?" He replied:
"Percy Bysshe Shelley is my name."

LITERARY NOTICES.

It is reported that when Mr. Keble first met his publisher after the appearance of the *Lyra Innocentium*, the latter congratulated him on the success of his new volume of poems, adding however, after the instinct of his craft, "You see, sir, there has been a very favourable review in the *Quarterly*." Mr. Keble may have thought, though he was far too modest to say so, that the *Quarterly* article was a tribute to the deserved popularity of the book rather than its cause. And certainly a collection of *Verses on Various Occasions* by Dr. Newman needs no recommendation from reviewers to ensure it a wide and eager circle of readers. Still we should be wanting in our duty as critics, if we do not give it a hearty welcome. There are two large classes of persons for whom the volume will have a special interest, over and above its high intrinsic excellence. Those who have been for years familiar with the *Lyra Apostolica*, as happens to be our own case, will rejoice to meet so many of their old favourites again, reinforced by fresh compositions not unworthy of their companionship. And the generation which has grown up since the Tractarian movement began, and knows not the *Lyra*, as well as the numerous outsiders who have first learnt thoroughly to appreciate Dr. Newman since reading his *Apologia*, will be grateful to him for allowing them this further glimpse into his inner life. Of the concluding poem in the volume, the "Dream of Gerontius," which alike in a poetical, a philosophical, and theological sense, is the most remarkable of all its contents, we spoke at some length on its original appearance.* It will therefore be sufficient to add here, that the deep and varied interest it evokes does not diminish, but grows on closer acquaintance. It would alone indeed give a permanent value to any volume that contained it. Of the remaining poems, something like two-thirds are reprinted from the *Lyra Apostolica*, in many instances with new titles, and not unfrequently with some alterations in the text. We wish these were fewer. Translations follow of all the Sunday and Ferial hymns in the Roman Breviary, and of a few for festivals, which are perfect models of what translations ought to be, combining strict fidelity to the spirit of the original with the purest idiomatic form. Most of them have appeared before in different manuals of devotion for the Hours, and the like; those who are in the habit of using Dr. Pusey's edition of

* See *Union Review* for July, 1865.

Avrillon's *Guide for Advent* will recognise at once the three Advent hymns, which retain in their English rendering all the force and fire of the Latin. To these are added about twenty new pieces—some of them, if we mistake not, never published before, composed since the author joined the Roman Church. There is no perceptible break of continuity between these and the poems from the *Lyra Apostolica;* the writer's mind has developed, but has not changed. In all alike there is the same unconsciousness and transparent sincerity which constitutes their peculiar charm. We feel that the poet is one who "sings because he must," and never writes for effect. When we add that Dr. Newman has now for the first time collected into one his various poetical compositions, ranging over a period of above forty years, we have said quite enough to ensure from our readers a ready and indeed enthusiastic reception for this most attractive volume. For those who know anything of his poetry already, we need say no more. Those who do not, may like to be assured that they will find in it the same passionate earnestness and intense realization of the unseen world, together with the same marvellous—we had almost said startling—power of *sympathy*, which has made his *Parochial Sermons* a lifelong treasure to thousands even who are little capable of appreciating their intellectual richness and depth. A great deal of his eloquent description of the *Christian Year*, in an old review of the *Lyra Innocentium*, is equally true of his own poetry, but there are marked differences between his style and Mr. Keble's, due no doubt in part to the difference of their outward lives. There is not certainly less tenderness in Dr. Newman's poetry than in Keble's, but there is less of the domestic and more of the ascetic element, though in this respect the *Lyra Innocentium* struck a somewhat bolder note than the *Christian Year*. We can hardly fancy Dr. Newman's writing the hymn for the "Third Sunday in Lent," one of the most exquisite in the whole *Christian Year*, especially its two most characteristic verses beginning "Oft as they watched at thoughtful eve." But neither can we conceive Keble writing, though he would have fully appreciated, the following pointed and nervous lines, which are not less markedly characteristic of their author. He has reprinted them *verbatim* from the *Lyra Apostolica*:—

THOU to wax fierce
  In the cause of the Lord,
To threat and to pierce
  With the heavenly sword!
Anger and Zeal,
  And the Joy of the brave,
Who bade *thee* to feel,
  Sin's slave.

The Altar's pure flame
  Consumes as it soars;
Faith meetly may blame,
  For it serves and adores.
Thou warnest and smitest!
  Yet Christ must atone
For a soul that thou slightest—
  Thine own.

In a very different tone, but no less faithfully representing another side of the author's mind, are the following beautiful stanzas, also from the *Lyra*, appearing here under the title of "Desolation."

O SAY not thou art left of God,
  Because His tokens in the sky
Thou canst not read; this earth He trod
  To teach thee He was ever nigh.

He sees, beneath the fig-tree green,
  Nathaniel con His sacred lore;
Shouldst thou thy chamber seek, unseen,
  He enters through the unopen'd door.

And when thou liest, by slumber bound,
  Outwearied in the Christian fight,
In glory, girt with Saints around,
  He stands above thee through the night.

When friends to Emmaus bend their course,
  He joins, although He holds their eyes:
Or, shouldst thou feel some fever's force,
  He takes thy hand, He bids thee rise.

Or on a voyage, when calms prevail,
  And prison thee upon the sea,
He walks the wave, He wings the sail,
  The shore is gain'd, and thou art free.

It would, by the way, be a great boon to many of Dr. Newman's readers, especially considering how often their old friends appear under new names, if an index of first lines could be appended to future editions. Perhaps we might also be allowed to plead for the restoration of some still missing of his former poems. Of the eighteen omitted pieces scarcely half are in any sense controversial. And among the rest are included some of the best in the whole *Lyra*. We would especially instance "Faint not, and fret not, for threatened woe," "Dear sainted friends, I call not you," and the beautiful lines on Froude's death, beginning, "Do not their souls, who 'neath the altar wait." It would not be fair to conclude without giving a specimen of the new

pieces. Unfortunately we can only find room for one. And we purposely select what is intended to illustrate a "distinctively Roman doctrine," as the phrase runs, to show how little there is in Dr. Newman's Romanism that any one who loves the name of Catholic need quarrel with. The poem is headed "The Queen of the Seasons," and is a "song for an inclement May:"—

ALL is divine
which the Highest has made,
Through the days that He wrought,
till the day when He stayed
Above and below,
within and around,
From the centre of space,
to its uttermost bound.

In beauty surpassing
the Universe smiled,
On the morn of its birth,
like an innocent child,
Or like the rich bloom
of some gorgeous flower;
And the Father rejoiced
in the work of His power.

Yet worlds brighter still,
and a brighter than those,
And a brighter again,
He had made, had He chose;
And you never could name
that conceivable best,
To exhaust the resources
the Maker possess'd.

But I know of one work
of His Infinite Hand,
Which special and singular
ever must stand;
So perfect, so pure,
and of gifts such a store,
That even Omnipotence
ne'er shall do more.

The freshness of May,
and the sweetness of June,
And the fire of July
in its passionate noon,
Munificent August,
September serene,
Are together no match
for my glorious Queen.

O Mary, all months
and all days are thine own,
In thee lasts their joyousness,
when they are gone;
And we give to thee May,
not because it is best,
But because it comes first,
and is pledge of the rest.

With these few words of grateful welcome, rather than of criticism, we commend to all our readers, old and young alike, Dr. Newman's new year's gift.

It is very easy to write one-sided controversial tales, when the author describes from imagination and not from nature, and relates events as he thinks they possibly might be. In *Edith Sydney*, by F. M. Oxenham (London: Burns), we have an Anglo-Roman tale written from the convert point of view, in which everybody worth speaking of goes over to Rome and lives reformed and happy, or dies in still greater happiness. The Anglican clergy are evidently made as good and as wise as the authoress knows how to make them, although the young ladies who talk the greatest nonsense as long as they are Anglicans, easily succeed in silencing their advisers as soon as they have convictions that there is no Church but the Roman. When any argument is advanced by an Anglican they either have a triumphant reply, or else are silenced though not convinced; but every utterance from a Roman priest is deemed conclusive, and accepted without question. Edith Sydney is an intensely repulsive girl from beginning to end, who, up to the time of her conversion, is always making the most vulgarly disagreeable speeches, a bad habit which she very properly but instantaneously leaves off when she becomes a Roman Catholic. Instead of submitting to no one, she never again disobeys, and from believing nothing she never appears troubled with a doubt. She ends as a Sister of S. Vincent de Paul; but unless even more changed than her biographer describes her to be, few would desire her presence in a sick room. Another young lady is introduced as a warning against weakness of character and trifling with convictions. Her knowledge of the English Church is "that Anglicans claimed to be in some way Catholics, and rested this claim on a supposed union of some kind with Rome;" and is much blamed for hesitating three years and informing herself a little better. All is vain, however! Anglican Sacraments can give no satisfaction, and having completely demolished her director by a little glib talking about "the only infallible Church," and "the living voice," to which he of course has no answer to make, she overcomes her final weaknesses (culminating in a most extra-

ordinary fainting-fit which must have been epileptic) and becomes ever after strong-minded and resolute. Reunionists, we understand, profess to be sacrificing themselves and their duty for the sake of their Church, hoping that they have just sacramental grace enough to get to heaven by. We find the old assumptions and the old arguments on every page, and the old love difficulties and separations with which we have long been familiar as throwing stumbling-blocks in the neophyte's path. The inevitable brain-fever of such works comes just at its right place, and its recurrence at another crisis is prevented by another astonishing fainting fit, which in half an hour leaves the patient convalescent. Indeed all the illnesses are most abnormal, and adapt themselves, like the religious symptoms, to the exigencies of the story in a way calculated to amaze doctors and confessors. Yet the work is meant to be fair, just, and generous. There are no unkind words or intentional exaggerations; but it is a story that no one could fancy to be true. Pride such as Edith's is not subdued in a moment by secession to Rome, or succeeded as suddenly by a vocation for the religious life; nor is the "superior intellect" ascribed both to herself and her lover in the least shown either by their conversations or their illogical arguments. Edith, for instance, disposes of all idea of branches to the one Church with the contemptuous question—"How can they be when they have no communion with each other?" Of course, when brothers and sisters will not speak to one another they have ceased to be members of the same family, or else this argument is not worthy of a superior intellect. Moreover *all* Roman priests do not necessarily know what to say at the right moment; nor do Anglicans invariably blunder; nor do Roman priests without education or refinement talk in precisely the same way as those who have both. If the writer would leave controversy and study nature, become a little better acquainted with Anglicans and with the natural course of illnesses, she might yet present us with a life-like fiction, but in the present work events and characters are alike impossibilities because inconsistent with themselves.

We have already expressed ourselves at some length on the controversy about infallibility going on between Father Ryder and Dr. Ward, the Editor of the *Dublin Review*.* There is nothing in the *Letter to W. G. Ward on his Theory of Infallible Instruction*, just published by the former, to alter our estimate of its general bearings. Father Ryder writes with the same incisive force as before, and in a clearer and more popular style. He still admits the abstract principle of Papal infallibility, which, as we have already pointed out, is at best a very pre-

* See *Union Review* for July, 1867.

carious basis for any effective argument against even its extremest claims. But he proves conclusively enough that the Roman Catholic Church has never committed herself to such claims as are now put forward in her name by the *Dublin* Reviewer, and that they are in themselves absolutely grotesque. The main interest, however, of the letter for the general reader —who will hardly care to follow the details of a minute and tangled controversy when one of the rival disputants is so voluminous and so clumsy a writer as Dr. Ward—lies in its incidental illustration of the subject of Church authority and of Dr. Ward's manner of treating it. As to the latter point, Father Ryder very happily reminds his opponent "that you have brought none of your controversies to a conclusion, because *you were never able for a single moment to appreciate any other position than your own.*" And while thanking Dr. Ward for "the uniformly courteous language" which he has—we may observe for the first time—brought himself to adopt in this controversy, he adds that such courtesy was the more meritorious in dealing with a writer whom he evidently regarded as simply "an idiot" who had been so ill-advised as to fall foul of him and of "the one orthodox belief" maintained by the *Dublin Review*. We can quite sympathise with Father Ryder in the complaint which follows about the "grotesque indecencies" of the "very strange beasts" who are Dr. Ward's camp-followers in the *Westminster Gazette* and *Weekly Register*. But we should as soon have looked for civility in such quarters as in the *Record* or the *Tizer*. And, as the *Westminster Gazette* is already, we believe, dying or dead—having failed in a pathetic appeal *ad misericordiam* to get itself incorporated with the *Tablet* or the *Weekly Register*,—its personal amenities are of little consequence. The real point at issue in the present discussion is whether the Church's infallibility extends only to the *depositum* and direct deductions from it, or whether she is commissioned to pronounce infallible judgments on all matters directly or indirectly *connected with it*, that is, in fact, *de omni scibili*. This is Dr. Ward's contention, and he insists, for instance, that she has taught infallibly "a vast mass of philosophical truth." Father Ryder's comment is not more brief than pertinent, though as being an appeal to facts it will no doubt seem to Dr. Ward quite irrelevant. "If it were so, we should, by this time, have got a philosophy. *Where is it?*" Echo answers, Where? Dr. Ward, as his critic observes, has divided the whole intellectual and moral world into two camps, Rome and Babylon—those who are with and those who are against him. Every argument against the latter is used "*ex abundanti*," as a kind condecension to their mental infirmity or moral obliquity. A distinguished English R. C. theologian, whom Cardinal Wiseman was in the habit of quoting as a standard authority, is contemptuously put aside as "noto.

riously unsound." It is amusingly characteristic of Dr. Ward, in more ways than one, that another eminent divine, a German Franciscan *of the last century*, is tabooed as "a pupil of Dr. Döllinger!" His oblivion of history appears, indeed, to extend to the New Testament, for in one place he expresses pious horror at Father Ryder's application of a term which is used in precisely the same sense by our Divine Lord Himself!

We must confess ourselves surprised to find Father Ryder considering the Church—that is the Pope—"*certainly* infallible" in the approval of new religious orders, and of the Vulgate translation; and "probably infallible" in censuring books as erroneous in faith and morals (we presume through the Congregation of the Index) and in canonizing saints. Such admissions, especially the two last, appear to us quite inconsistent with his general principle. It is right to add that he ascribes infallibility only to "the *official* mind of the Pope, expressed in the formal language of the Church, and *en rapport* with her," though the precise force of this limitation is not very clear. He is quite ready to accept the condemnations of the recent Syllabus "*when submitted to such theological interpretation as Mgr. Dupanloup has suggested.*" So are we. But no one who really believed that hybrid document to be an infallible utterance of the Holy Spirit could tolerate for a moment a method of interpretation which explains every passage about which there is any real difficulty simply by explaining it away. It was perfectly natural for the Bishop of Orleans—who is said to have gone down on his knees to the Pope to entreat him not to stultify the Holy See by publishing the Encyclical and Syllabus—to try and make the best of a bad matter by reducing his acceptance of a document Roman Catholic Bishops cannot with impunity repudiate, into some conformity with reason and common sense. It is equally natural that Dr. Ward, who professes to discover in the Syllabus a kind of inspired Encyclopedia of moral, philosophical, and political truth, should view such methods of interpretation much as a Recordite views Tract 90. We have more than once called attention in this REVIEW to the approved Ultramontane system of dealing with such awkward facts as the heresy of Pope Honorius. There is a quiet *naiveté* about Father Ryder's statement of this "point of Church policy." His courtesy leads him to say "we," but he is of course describing the tactics of the school Dr. Ward leads in this country. "We cannot bear to think of Honorius as condemned by a General Council [which he certainly was], *so we instinctively either force upon him an orthodox sense, or wrap his shortcomings in a mist of historic doubt.*" In other words, we "instinctively" cook history to suit our *à priori* theories. It is no wonder that writers who can thus play fast and loose with historical truth have laid themselves open in their dealings

with their contemporaries to the scathing rebuke: "If yo must make Guy Fawkes representations of your enemies, yo should at least have them decently stuffed." Those who wis to see a moderate and perspicuous statement of a very modifie form of Ultramontanism, with all its worst features expunge should read the whole of Father Ryder's letter. One thing w can promise them. While they will find no lack of brilliar and telling satire, there is not one syllable of discourtesy c ill-nature from beginning to end of either of his pamplets. Th controversial writings of which this can be predicated ma almost, we fear, be counted on the fingers of one hand. Th following admirable passage on one of the nicknames latel invented by Dr. Ward's friends of the *Westminster Gazette*, i order to throw dirt at their opponents and dust in the eye of the public, is well worth quoting, and it is the only extrac we can make room for here.

"In its good sense, I regard the term 'Minimizer' a applicable, in its degree, to all who *think*, in contradistinctio to those who merely *feel*, upon the subject of authorit Amongst the lovers of authority, its critics, *i.e.* those wh endeavour to explore its precise nature and limits, will ever b outnumbered by its indiscriminating zealots. 'Auctoritate esse rem omnium delicatissimam, satis compertum est,' s Muratori observes. But where the authority is Divine, imposes itself its own limits; and those who would nicely i vestigate them, in order to discover where the Divine prece ends, are only showing their reverence for an ordinance God. For my own part, I never could understand how a ma can be zealous for the Law, unless he sharply defines i boundaries. To amplify the skirts of the Law, upon th principle of Tutiorism, as did the Pharisee of old, has nev been countenanced by the Church. What probabilism is i moral, that is Minimism in dogmatic theology; they are bot based upon a common principle. 'Lex dubia non obligat.' consider that, where it is a question of laying down what is universal obligation *sub gravi*, it is simply the duty of eve Christian to minimize. If a determination to carry out th principle to the utmost, at all costs, constitutes a minimizer, can only say that I am proud of the name."

We will add but one concluding observation. We have oft been taken to task or taunted by the *Dublin Review* for t heresy, the ignorance, the shallowness, the absurdity, and know not what, of our attacks on its cherished theologic system. Well; here is a crushing condemnation of the who system,—an emphatic assertion of what we have over and ov again asserted or implied, that "to think with the Church does *not* mean to hold the opinions most popular in the Chur

of our own day, which may often prove to be false, but to think with the Church of all ages—coming, not from an Anglican critic, or from anybody even the *Dublin Review* can have the effrontery to brand as an unsound and disloyal Catholic, but from a learned Oratorian priest living under the roof, and writing with at least the sanction, of the greatest living divine in the Roman Catholic Church!

In *Three Legends of the Early Church*, by Christopher J. Retihmüller (Bell and Daldy), we have, rendered into respectable verse, the well-known traditions of the Flight of S. Peter, when, met by our Blessed Lord with His Cross, he asked *Domine, quo vadis?* A Dirge of the Catacombs, treating of the martyrdom of S. Paul; and S. John before the Latin Gate. The language, though lacking force and brilliancy, and often a little prosaic, is clear and simple; while some parts of the last poem are characterised by much sweetness and devotional feeling. On the whole this volume—which is well printed and attractively got up—is pleasing and commendable, and well adapted for a gift-book.

We call the attention of those of our readers who do not already possess it, to Mr. Carter's admirable Manual for Confession entitled *Repentance*, (London: J. H. Parker). It contains all that is needful in the way of full instruction on the subject; a very complete and beautiful collection of devotions, interspersed with well-chosen hymns; a searching set of questions for self-examination, with a concluding chapter on the "Life of Conversion." We need hardly add that it is a book specially suitable for the present penitential season, and for the use of those who desire so to do, but as yet have not frequented the the tribunal of Penance.

A very pretty book of practical directions for the floral decoration of churches, called *Flowers and Festivals*, by W. A. Barrett (London: Rivingtons), should be in the hands of all who approve and wish to accomplish elaborate work of this sort. It contains some interesting historical notes on the subject, and explanations of the various symbolical forms usually employed in floral decoration; while the fullest instructions are given for the carrying out of about forty designs which appear in coloured plates at the end of the book.

Mr. Hodges, of Froome, has commenced a new series of parish tracts in the shape of *Church Ballads*, of which we have received two numbers. These treat respectively of Baptism and Confirmation, and are attractive reading for children, who could easily commit them to memory. The *Stories on the Festivals*, from the same publisher, are now to be had complete in one volume, or in four packets. On the whole they are good and successful, though sometimes, as we have had occasion to

point out, weak and exaggerated. The author of them is preparing a set of "Sunday Stories for the Christian Year," uniform with the above.

Most able and admirable is a volume by Mr. S. Pagan, entitled, *The Principles of Religion*, (London: Mozley). It is a full and complete commentary on the Church Catechism, containing a large amount of well-arranged information, set forth in a thoroughly systematic manner. Evidently the work of years, by a man of extended reading and wide experience, we gain in its pages a complete exposition from Holy Scripture, the Fathers and the Councils, of Christian principles. It deserves the highest commendation, and we trust it may have a wide circulation.

A third edition of Mr. Upton Richards's, *Life of Faith*, a small but valuable book, has been issued by our publisher. We should also notice a new edition of *The Portuary for the Laity*, (London: Parker,) in larger and plainer type.

Mr. G. G. Lawrence writes on *The Present Relations of the Church and State in England*, (London: Macintosh,) with both some knowledge and some care. But his remarks only skim the surface of the subject, and he is quite at sea on first principles. His book nevertheless is an evidence that the question discussed is occupying men's thoughts. And this is well.

The Rev. J. B. Wilkinson has privately printed a small *Manual for Confession*, which may be obtained in packets of a hundred of Mr. Prynne, of Plymouth. It seems to us to be in every respect suitable for the purpose for which it was compiled, and, moreover, it is inexpensive.

The *Convent Prize Book*, (London: Washbourne,) is a small volume of pleasing Christian verses, unequal in power, but thoroughly devout in spirit, from a Scotch Roman Catholic pen.

Art. XI.—THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

It has been observed by the Dean of Canterbury in an article which appeared in the February number of the *Contemporary Review*, on "The Union of Christendom in its Home Aspect," that "it is at length beginning to be felt that bluster is not proof."* Unfortunately for the Dean, his observation has never received a more complete illustration than in the attitude which he has himself assumed towards the great Communion of the West. Like a boomerang which has missed its aim, it recoils on the unskilful assailant.

It is almost impossible to conceive that any one acquainted, even in the most superficial degree, with the teaching and practice of the Roman Church could have written the following paragraph:—

"Rome is essentially a Pagan city. Her churches, numerous as the days of the year, rise everywhere around you. Bells are continually going; the commemoration of saints and martyrs is endless. Yet, with very rare exceptions indeed, the *worship of the people* in those churches has nothing in common with Christianity. It is not even the one God of Jews and Christians who, as matter of fact, is adored in them: it is not He whom Christians believe to be God blessed for ever, Incarnate in the flesh of man. God has passed out from the practical worship of this people: the Son of God has, as matter of fact, ceased to be an object of their adoration. The Eternal Father is found in their pictures as an old man,—the Divine Saviour as a little child; but both are subservient, and nearly all their worship is subservient, to one purpose: to the glorification of a great goddess, and, after her, not of the Father, Son, nor Spirit, but of a host of men and women, made into objects of adoration by themselves, and, whatever may be alleged to the contrary, clothed, as she is pre-eminently clothed, with the incommunicable attributes of the Godhead itself."†

It is unnecessary to remind our readers that such wild and reckless statements are as opposed to fact as they are destitute of charity. They rest on no solid foundation; they are supported by no legitimate arguments. To use the Dean's own words, "bluster is not proof."

The Church of Rome, in common with the rest of Christendom, gives supreme worship to the Blessed Trinity

* p. 173.

† *Letters from Abroad*, pp. 73, 74.

alone. It is to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Three Persons and One God, that it pays the highest act of adoration of which the creature is capable—the Offering of our Incarnate Lord in the Sacrifice of the Mass. And so in the devotions of its individual members: it will be found, if our enquiries are not too superficial, that the great truth that "there is but one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus,"* is as fully recognised by them as it is among ourselves, and, as well in *fact* as in theory, forms the sole basis of their hope.

It is true that the Blessed Virgin receives from members of the Roman Communion a degree of reverence which, as far as its outward expression is concerned, appears to us to approach too closely to the honour which should be given unto God alone: but we have no right to assume, as we are so apt to do, that such expressions of reverence must necessarily awaken in them the sentiments which would be excited in us, if we were ourselves to make use of them. And, as a matter of fact, they do not. "May God's mercy keep me"—they are the words of Dr. Newman—"from the shadow of a thought dimming the light or blunting the keenness of that love of Him, which is our sole happiness and our sole salvation! But surely when He became man, He brought home to us His incommunicable attributes with a distinctiveness which precludes the possibility of our lowering Him by exalting a creature. He alone has an entrance into our soul, reads our secret thoughts, speaks to our heart, applies to us spiritual pardon and strength. On Him we solely depend. He alone is our inward life; He not only regenerates us, but (to allude to a higher mystery) *semper gignit;* He is ever renewing our new birth and our heavenly sonship. In this sense He may be called, as in nature, so in grace, our real Father. Mary is only our adopted Mother, given us from the Cross; her presence is above, not on earth; her office is external, not within us. Her name is not heard in the administration of the Sacraments. Her work is not one of ministration towards us; her power is indirect. It is her prayers that avail, and they are effectual by the *fiat* of Him Who is our all in all. Nor does she hear us by any innate power, or any personal gift; but by His manifestation to her of the prayers which we make her. When Moses was on the Mount, the Almighty told him of the idolatry of his people at the foot of it, in order that he might intercede for them; and thus it is the Divine Presence which is the intermediating Power by which we reach her and she reaches us.

* 1 Tim. ii. 5.

"Woe is me, if even by a breath I sully these ineffable truths! But still, without prejudice to them, there is, I say, another range of thought quite distinct from them, incommensurate with them, of which the Blessed Virgin is the centre. If we placed our Lord in that centre, we should only be degrading Him from His throne, and making Him an Arian kind of a God; that is, no God at all. He who charges us with making Mary a divinity, is thereby denying the divinity of Jesus. Such a man does not know what divinity is. Our Lord cannot pray for us, as a creature, as Mary prays; He cannot inspire those feelings which a creature inspires. To her belongs, as being a creature, a natural claim on our sympathy and familiarity, in that she is nothing else than our fellow. She is our pride,—in the poet's words, 'Our tainted nature's solitary boast.' We look to her without any fear, any remorse, any consciousness that she is able to read us, judge us, punish us. Our heart yearns towards that pure Virgin, that gentle Mother, and our congratulations follow her, as she rises from Nazareth and Ephesus, through the choirs of angels to her throne on high. So weak, yet so strong; so delicate, yet so glory-laden; so modest, yet so mighty. She has sketched for us her own portrait in the Magnificat: 'He hath regarded the lowliness of His hand-maiden. For behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. For He that is mighty hath magnified me, and holy is His Name. And His mercy is on them that fear Him throughout all generations. He hath showed strength with His arm: He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts. He hath put down the mighty from their seat, and hath exalted the humble and meek. He hath filled the hungry with good things; and the rich He hath sent empty away.'"*

If, however, because "in times and places it has fallen into abuse," and has even "become a superstition,"† we still feel that it is our duty to protest against the worship which is paid her; it would at least be well for us to remember that it is as possible to err on the side of defect as on that of excess, and that, until the Mother of our God receives from us the honour to which, on the authority of the Sacred Scriptures themselves,‡ she is entitled, it is unjust to be severe in our condemnation of those who, as we believe, assign her more than is her due.

* *Letter to Dr. Pusey*, pp. 89-91. † Ibid. p. 93.
‡ Luke i. 28, 42-4; xi. 27. John ii. 4, 5; xix. 26, 27.

And the remarks we have already made are applicable to another, yet kindred question: we refer to the Immaculate Conception. When men holding high office in the Church of England, in imitation of the blasphemies of Helvidius, deny that our Lady is ἀειπάρθενος,—the ever-Virgin—and, reviving the heresy of Nestorius, refuse to acknowledge her to be the Mother of God, we are not in a position to condemn the rest of the Western Church for maintaining her Immaculate Conception. But this is not all. We have too often approached the consideration of this question under the influence of that intellectual vice which is so ably exposed by Paley in his "Evidences of Christianity,"—"contempt prior to examination." And the result has shown "how little reliance can be placed on the most acute judgments in subjects which they are pleased to despise."* We have failed to understand the teaching of the Church of Rome on this subject; and, as a necessary consequence, we have thoroughly misrepresented it. The Immaculate Conception conveys a very different idea to the Roman Catholic and to the Anglican. The only meaning which the latter appears to be able to attach to it is the withdrawal of the Blessed Virgin from the necessity of redemption. It is not so with his Roman brother. Whatever the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception may imply, Roman Catholic theologians distinctly assert that the Conception of the Virgin Mary bears no comparison with that of her Eternal Son; that in sanctity it differs, not in kind, but in degree, from that which we willingly allow to Jeremiah and St. John the Baptist before their birth;† and that it is not inconsistent with the truth, which they acknowledge equally with ourselves, that she fell in Adam, and was redeemed in Christ.‡

* *Evidences of Christianity*, ed. Whately, Part III. c. iv. p. 357.

† "You believe with us that S. John Baptist had grace given to him three months before his birth, at the time the Blessed Virgin visited his mother. He accordingly was *not* immaculately conceived, because he was alive before grace came to him; but our Lady's case only differs from his in this respect, that to her grace came, not three months merely before her birth, but from the first moment of her being, as it had been given to Eve." (Dr. Newman, *Letter to Dr. Pusey*, p. 50.)

‡ "We consider that in Adam she died, as others; that she was included, together with the whole race, in Adam's sentence; that she incurred his debt as we do; but that, for the sake of Him who was to redeem her and us upon the Cross, to her the debt was remitted by anticipation, on her the sentence was not carried out, except indeed as regards her natural death, for she died when her time came, as others." (*Idem*, p. 51.) And Father Perrone, for many years Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the Collegio Romano, writes to the same effect in the *Thesis Dogmatica de Immaculata B.V.M. Conceptione*, appended to the Paris edition of his *Prælectiones*

But what are our own sentiments? It would, perhaps, be difficult to express them. We do not wish to be wise above that which is written. We are ready to accept the decision of the Church. And in the mean time we strive to enter into the spirit of St. Augustine's words: "Concerning the holy Virgin Mary, for the honour of our Lord, I wish no question to be raised at

Theologicæ, a work which is used as a text-book in all the Jesuit seminaries of Europe:—"Eo ipso quod *intuitu meritorum Christi* affirmetur ejusmodi gratia ac privilegio aucta B.V. Mariæ anima, patet non excludi B. Virginem a communi redemptione, sed eam prorsus fuisse sanguine Christi redemptam, quamvis singulari illa redemptionis specie, quæ præservationis fuerit, ita ut Christus illi meruerit præservationem ab originalis labis incursu." (Vol. ii. Part III. c. iv., prop. 1, § 6, p. 649.)

In the face of these admissions—and no Roman Catholic theologian would hesitate to make them—it is to be regretted that the Bishop of Ely, as reported in the *Guardian* of February 28, 1868, should have declared in his place in Convocation, that "as a Bishop of the Church of England he was prepared to say that the 'Immaculate Conception' was a distinct *heresy* against the Incarnation and the Mediation of our Blessed Lord." Assertion, however, is not argument; and, until the Church of England has in express terms condemned it, the Bishop of Ely's protest to the contrary notwithstanding, the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin is, and will remain, an open question with us.

As to the truth of the doctrine, it would be presumptuous for us to express an opinion, since the question could not be discussed with the care its importance requires within the limits of a note. We will merely observe that the arguments adduced from the Fathers and the Schoolmen in opposition to it appear to be wide of the mark. Nothing can be inferred from the statements of S. Basil, (Ep. 260), S. Chrysostom, (*In Matt.* Hom. iv., Hom. xliv.), and S. Cyril, (*In Joann.* lib. xii.), beyond the fact of their assertion that the Blessed Virgin was not free from natural infirmity: whilst it was the object of S. Bernard, (Epist. clxxiv.), and S. Thomas, (*Summa Theolog.* part iii. quæst. 27, Artt. 1, 2), to insist (i.) that her body was formed, as ours, in the natural way of generation, and (ii.) that she was not exempt from the necessity of redemption. It is scarcely necessary to remark that natural infirmity is not sin, in the proper acceptation of the term; and, from the passages we have already quoted from the writings of Roman Catholic divines, it must be evident to every unprejudiced mind, that the Church of Rome in its definition of the Immaculate Conception is not opposed to the teaching of S. Bernard and S. Thomas. The contradiction is apparent, not real—in language, and not in thought.

The Church of England has maintained a prudent reserve: but as the Conception of the Virgin Mary is one of the Minor Festivals appointed in the Calendar, (*Dec.* 8), it may, perhaps, be inferred what its decision would have been, if it had thought right to exercise its authority. And this inference will appear the more probable, if we remember that S. Bernard reproved the Clergy of Lyons, for introducing the observance of the Festival when the doctrine had not been defined by the Church, and that S. Thomas appealed to the celebration of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin as an argument in favour of her Immaculate Birth. It would, we believe, be found on examination, that it has never been the custom of the Church to appoint a Festival, whether of greater or less obligation, except with the intention of commemorating an event which was not in accordance with the ordinary experience of mankind. The Immaculate Conception, whether it is true or not, is opposed neither to the spirit nor to the letter of the English formularies.

all, when we are treating of sin."* We love to dwell on the sweet lines of the poet :—

> "Mother! whose virgin-bosom was uncrost
> With the least shade of thought to sin allied;
> Woman, above all women glorified,
> Our tainted nature's solitary boast:
> Purer than foam on central ocean tost,
> Brighter than eastern skies at day-break strewn
> With fancied roses, than th' unblemished moon
> Before her wane begins on heaven's blue coast,
> Thy image falls to earth. Yet some, I ween,
> Not unforgiven the suppliant knee might bend
> As to a visible power, in whom did blend
> All that was mixed and reconciled in thee
> Of mother's love with maiden purity,
> Of high with low, celestial with terrene."†

But it will be well to anticipate an objection. It may be said that such sentiments are opposed to the 15th Article; the title of which—"Of Christ *alone* without sin"—precludes an English Clergyman from honestly entertaining the idea of the sinlessness of the Blessed Virgin.

It will be sufficient to reply that—not to insist that the fact that Christ *alone*, although subject to want and pain, was removed from *all possibility* of sin, and that it was in and through Him that His Mother derived her sanctity, is a satisfactory explanation of the title—the objection will admit of an appropriate answer if we consider the scope of the Article itself.

"It asserts," as the Bishop of Brechin has so well observed, "in broad terms, the actual sinfulness of mankind. It points out that in spite of our high privileges in the Gospel; of our being taken out of the state of nature and put in the state of grace; of our being by baptism buried and risen with Christ; of our being born of water and of the Holy Ghost; it is certain that we shall not escape all sins. Though God gives us grace to fulfil His law, though He enables us to meet each temptation as it arises, though He bestows on us sufficient helps to serve Him; as a matter of fact, we do not do so. . . The Article does not speak of exceptional cases. It says, 'all we the rest.' It does not commit itself to what may be the

* "Excepta itaque sancta Virgine Maria, de qua propter honorem Domini nullam prorsus cum de peccatis agitur, haberi volo quæstionem." (*De Nat. et Grat.* c. 36.)

† Wordsworth.

case with regard to saints whom God may by a special prerogative save from sin; as was the case, under the old law, with Zacharias and Elisabeth, who (albeit they might not have been free from infirmities) walked in *all* the ordinances of the Lord blameless; or, as must be the case with regard to His own Holy Mother, of whom, though we may imagine imperfections as possible, yet with whom, for the honour of her Son, we can associate no idea of sin. . . . . That the Blessed Virgin is not included necessarily in this condemnation may be inferred from the language of the rest of the formularies. The Collect for Christmas dwells on our Lord's birth from 'a pure virgin.' The Preface, 'that He was made very man of her substance, and that without spot of sin.' The Homily on Repentance, in a short dogmatic statement, speaks of 'Jesus Christ, who, being true and natural God, equal and of one substance with the Father, did at the time appointed take upon Him our frail nature in the Blessed Virgin's womb, *and that of her undefiled substance.*' . . . . In that of Wilful Rebellion it speaks of 'this most noble and most virtuous Lady, which doth well teach us who in comparison to her are most base and vile.'"*

But the meaning of the dogmatic statements of our formularies is, in case of doubt, to be determined by the "animus ecclesiæ imponentis;" and this cannot, perhaps, receive a better illustration in reference to the question before us than from the Sermons of Dr. Frank, Archdeacon of St. Alban's, Chaplain to Archbishop Sheldon at the time the Prayer Book was brought into its present form in A.D. 1662, and received the united sanction of Convocation, Parliament, and the Sovereign. His observations derive additional weight from the circumstance of the licensing of theological books being a part of his official duty, as well as from the fact that his sermons received the *imprimatur* of the Archbishop. The following extracts will show with sufficient clearness what his thoughts upon this important subject were.

As to the condition of the Blessed Virgin, he says that "the Lord being with her, all goodness must needs be with her." † "For sanctifying graces, none fuller, *solo Deo excepto*, saith Epiphanius. And it is fit enough to believe that she who was so highly honoured to have her womb filled with the body of the Lord, had her soul as fully filled by the Holy Ghost." ‡ "Thou that art highly favoured; high in God's grace and

* *Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles*, vol. i. pp. 223-6.

† Sermon xxx. vol. ii. p. 44. ‡ Ibid. p. 46.

favour—so high, as to be made His Mother, then sure, made a fit receptacle for so great and so holy a guest, by the fulness of all grace and goodness."* "She was an immaculate and unspotted Virgin."†

As to her position in the economy of grace, he observes, "So we have done with him (the Angel Gabriel); come we now to her—a greater than he—if we may speak with Epiphanius and some others."‡ "The Virgin Mother, the Eternal Son. The most blessed among women, the fairest of the sons of men. The woman clothed with the Sun, the Son compassed with a woman. She the gate of Heaven; He the King of Glory that came forth. She the Mother of the Everlasting God; He God without a Mother; God blessed for evermore. Great persons as ever met upon a day."§ "Made as it were the Queen of Heaven."‖

And once more, as to the honour which is her due, he says that "our Lord is wounded through our Lady's sides by those who will not suffer her to be blessed as she should."¶ "Give we in God's name the honour due to her."**

In would be an interesting inquiry to ascertain how far such language has been used by other divines of the Church of England since the Reformation. To do this in an exhaustive manner would far exceed the limits at our disposal. A rapid survey will, however, be sufficient for our purpose.

It would be found on examination that, from the Reformation downwards, there have been three schools of opinion in the English Church with regard to the character and position of the Blessed Virgin. But few supposed—a view entertained, alas! by so many in our own day††—that honour was conferred on our Lord by dishonouring His Mother. Such an idea cannot be otherwise than abhorrent to the instinct of Christendom. Bishop Bull‡‡ may be taken as the representative of that numerous class, which, whilst recognising the singular grace and blessedness of Mary, out of a not unnatural

* Sermon xxx. vol. ii. p. 47. † Ibid. p. 38. ‡ Ibid. p. 39.
§ Sermon vi. vol. i. p. 77. ‖ Ibid. p. 79.
¶ Sermon xxx. vol. ii. p. 35. ** Ibid. p. 50.

†† In proof of this it will be sufficient to refer to the Dean of Canterbury's remarks on the "Brethren of the Lord," in his edition of the Greek Testament (S. Matthew xiii. 55), and to Mr. F. W. Farrar's Article on the same subject in Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*. The indecent view of Helvidius is seriously maintained by both! The question is examined in a different spirit, and with a more satiafactory result, by Dr. Lightfoot, in an exhaustive Dissertation appended to his able *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. Dr. Mill on *the Mystical Interpretation of the Gospels*, ed. 1861, pp. 267-274, will of course be consulted by the student.

‡‡ Works, vol. i. Sermon iv., passim.

jealousy for the unapproachable grandeur and incommunicable attributes of her divine Son, refused to look upon her as free from the taint of sin, or to give her those titles which the fearless piety of antiquity did not hesitate to bestow upon her.* Still there have always been those who have

* The learning of Bishop Bull, his able defence of the Catholic Faith, and the estimation in which he is deservedly held, seem to require that his sentiments on the character and position of the Blessed Virgin should be given in his own words. He reminds us that "She was of all women, of all the virgins in Israel, elected and chosen by God to be the instrument of bringing into the world the long-desired Messias." He observes that "The Blessed Virgin Mary was the only woman that took off the stain and dishonour of her sex, by being the instrument of bringing That into the world, which should repair and make amends for the loss and damage brought to mankind by the transgression of the first woman Eve. By a woman, as the principal cause, we were first undone; and by a woman, as an instrument, under God, a Saviour and Redeemer is born to us. And the Blessed Virgin Mary is that woman." He remarks that "The Blessed Virgin was consecrated to be a temple of the Divinity in a singular manner. For the eternal Son of God, by an ineffable conjunction, united Himself to that human nature, which was miraculously conceived and formed in her, even whilst it was within her: and so He that was born of her at the very time that He was born of her, was Θεάνθρωπος, *God and Man.* O astonishing condescension of the Son of God! O wonderful advancement of the Blessed Virgin! . . Upon which account the Fathers of the Third General Council at Ephesus, convened against Nestorius, approved the title of Θεοτόκος, the Mother of God, given to the Blessed Virgin." And he infers—it would be well for the Dean of Canterbury to remember this—that "The necessary consequence of this dignity of the Blessed Virgin is, that she remained for ever a virgin, *as the Catholic Church hath always held and maintained.* For it cannot *with decency* be imagined, that the most holy vessel, which was thus once consecrated to be a receptable of the Deity, should afterwards be desecrated and profaned by human use."

As to our attitude towards her, he observes, "We think and speak most respectfully of her, and do not ordinarily mention her name without an epithet of honour." "We sing in our daily service her excellent Magnificat; and thereby we testify our assent to, and our complacence in, those singular favours that God is therein said to have bestowed on her." "We celebrate two annual festivals in her memorial." "And if we could think of any other honour that we could do her, without dishonouring God the Father and His Eternal Son, we would most willingly yield it to her."

But on the other hand, he says, "We will not give her lavish and excessive attributes, beyond what the Holy Scriptures allow her, and the holy men of the Primitive Church afforded her. We will call her *Blessed.*" "But we dare not call her Queen of Heaven, Queen of Angels, Source of the Fountain of grace, Refuge of sinners, Comfort of the afflicted, Advocate of all Christians." "We will not ascribe those excellencies to her that she never had nor could have; as, a fulness of habitual grace, more grace than all the angels and archangels of God put together ever had; that she was born without original sin, and never committed any the least actual sin, and consequently never needed a Saviour." "We will not give her the honour of invocation or praying to her." "Lastly, we abominate the impious imposture of those who have translated the most humble and holy Virgin into an idol of pride and vanity."

We will merely observe that if Bishop Bull's sentiments respecting the Blessed Virgin were held by all English Churchmen, our Roman Catholic brethren could not in fairness reproach us as "*Beatæ Virginis Conviciatores.*" We do not deny

freely acknowledged the spotless beauty of her life, and have exhausted the powers of language in speaking of her august prerogatives. The following quotations from the writings of post-Reformation divines from the sixteenth century to the present day will place this in the clearest light.

Latimer, in his "Sermon of the Plough," may speak for the earliest Reformers. "It hath been said of me," he remarks, "O Latimer, nay, as for him, I will never believe him while I live, nor never trust him, for he likened our

that the Cultus of our Lady has at times degenerated into superstition: we allow that every occasion of stumbling, as far as is consistent with the interests of truth, should be removed: and we confess that many Roman Catholic writers have used expressions in reference to the Blessed Virgin which, as understood by us, are perfectly indefensible, and deserve the severest censure. But, on the other hand, it is a matter of fact that, of the titles singled out by Bishop Bull for reprehension, some are to be met with in the writings of approved divines of the Church of England; whilst others, or at least equivalent expressions, are freely employed by the Fathers of the Primitive Church. In proof of the former statement it will be sufficient to remind our readers that Dr. Frank speaks of the Blessed Virgin as the "Queen of heaven;" Mr. Isaac Williams, of her being "highly exalted, it may be above the creation of God;" and, long before either, Dr. Donne addresses her as "Queen of Queens," "that she-cherubim which unlocked Paradise." The panegyrical language of S. Cyril in the Third Œcumenical Council will give us some idea of the sacred affection with which she was regarded by the ancient Fathers: "Hail, Holy and Mysterious Trinity, which hast called us together to the Church of Mary, Mother of God! Hail, Mary, Mother of God; majestic heirloom of the whole world; the lamp unquenchable, the crown of virginity; . . . the dwelling of the Illimitable; . . . through whom the Holy Trinity is sanctified; . . . through whom angels and archangels rejoice, devils are put to flight, . . . and the fallen creature is received up into the heavens." (Opp. t. vi. p. 355.) Yet after all, what are these, or any of the titles to which Bishop Bull specially objects, in comparison with that one awful and majestic name which is given her by the Universal Church, Θεοτόκος, the Mother of God! "No wonder," to use the words of the Bishop of Brechin, "that the pious sentiment of Christendom in the contemplation of this stupendous dignity should have burst forth in finding paraphrases for this wondrous term, that it should awake to the conception of an ideal of female holiness, such as no mere human reason could attain unto. No wonder that poetry has strained her utmost to find words to describe the celestial glories of her whom all generations call blessed, or that the art of the limner and sculptor should have been taxed to the full to embody in external expression those marvellous combinations of lowliness and glory, of grace and strength, which attend on the idea of the creature-mother of the Creator-Son." (*Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles*, vol. i. pp. 32, 33.) Nor, again, can we deny that to be "born without original sin," or to be free from "any the least actual sin," does not of necessity imply exemption from "the need of a Saviour." The necessary grace may have been given to Mary—we do not assert that it was—as a special privilege in anticipation of the merits of her divine Son. And, once more, as to the question of Invocation, we must not forget that Dr. Montague, Bishop of Chichester and Norwich, a contemporary of Bishop Andrewes, did not hesitate to avow, "I see no absurdity in nature, no incongruity unto analogy of faith, no repugnancy at all to Sacred Scripture, much less impiety, for any man to say, as those of the Roman Church do, 'Holy Mary, pray for me.'" (*Invocation of Saints*, p. 118.

Blessed Lady to a saffron-bag! when indeed I never used that similitude. But in case I had used this similitude, it had not been to be reproved, but might have been without reproach. For I might have said thus: As the saffron-bag that hath been full of saffron, or hath had saffron in it, doth ever after savour and smell of the sweet saffron that it contained, so our Blessed Lady, which conceived and bare Christ in her womb, did ever after resemble the manners and virtues of that precious Babe that she bare. And what had our Blessed Lady been the worse for this? or what dishonour was this to our Blessed Lady?"*

In the next generation Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Donne, Dean of St. Paul's, continue the tradition. The former writes as follows:—"Making mention of the all-holy, undefiled, and more than blessed Mary, Mother of God and ever-Virgin." †

The language of the Dean is very remarkable. We quote from the present Dean of Canterbury's edition of his works:

THE ANNUNCIATION.

"Salvation to all that will is nigh,
That All, which always is All everywhere,
Which cannot sin, and yet all sins must bear,
Which cannot die, yet cannot choose but die,
Lo, faithful Virgin, yields Himself to lie
In prison in thy womb, and though He there
Can take no sin, *nor thou give*, yet He will wear,
Taken from thence, flesh, which death's force may try."

THE VIRGIN MARY.

"For that fair blessed Mother-maid,
Whose flesh redeemed us; that she-cherubim,
Which unlocked paradise, and made
One claim for innocence and disseised sin,
Whose womb was a strange heaven, for there
God clothed Himself, and grew,
Our zealous thanks we pour. As her deeds were
Our helps, so are her prayers; nor can she sue
In vain, who hath such titles unto you."

ON THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

"In that, O Queen of Queens! thy birth was free
From that which others doth of grace bereave,
When in their mother's womb they life receive,
God, as His sole-born daughter, loved thee.

* See Bishop Forbes on the Thirty-nine Articles, vol. i. p. 33, note.
† Private Devotions, for Thursday.

To match thee like thy birth's nobility.
He thee His Spirit for thy spouse did leave,
By Whom thou didst His holy Son conceive,
And so was linked to all the Trinity.

Cease then, O Queens! that earthly crowns do wear,
To glory in the pomp of earthly things;
If men such high respects unto you bear,
Which daughters, wives, and mothers, are of kings,
What honour can unto that Queen be done
Who had your God for Father, Spouse, and Son?"*

Nor is it in verse only that the worthy Doctor dwells on the incommunicable privileges of our Lady. The following quotations from his Sermons will show that what we have already adduced is not to be explained away by the supposition of mere poetical license:—"He chose a woman full of grace to be His Mother."† "The Virgin Mary, whom no man can honour too much that makes her not God."‡ He considers, however, that the Immaculate Conception is beside the honour which is her due. "But, says Luther, . . . 'at the inanimation, at the quickening, she was preserved from original sin.' Now what needs this? May I not say that I had rather be redeemed by Christ Jesus than be innocent, rather be beholden to Christ's death for my salvation, than to Adam's standing in his innocency? Epiphanius said enough, *par detrimentum afferunt religioni*, they hurt religion as much that ascribe too little to the Blessed Virgin as they who ascribe too much."§ And the good old Puritan, Bishop Hall, writes:—"O Blessed Mary, he cannot bless thee, he cannot honour thee too much, that deifies thee not."‖

And such language is not to be accounted for on the theory that, as the Reformation was necessarily incomplete at first, many expressions might be found in earlier writers which the more exact theology of the Caroline divines refused to tolerate; for, as we have seen, similar statements are met with in the Sermons of Dr. Frank. And Bishop Cosin writes in the same spirit: "Mary was a woman that had found grace and favour with God, a woman that was saluted from heaven with an angel, one whom all generations were to call blessed, who was then a saint on earth, who is now a saint in heaven."¶ Bishop Jeremy Taylor, who died a few years before him,

* Vol. vi. pp. 443, 535, 559. † Vol. i. Sermon III. p. 47.
‡ Vol. i. Sermon V. p. 93. § Vol. i. Sermon II. p. 37.
‖ *Contemplations*, ed. S. P. C. K. 1842, vol. i. p. 113.
¶ Vol. i. Sermon III. p. 51.

says, "When the Son of God was incarnate in the womb of His Virgin Mother, the Holy Maid arose; and though she was super-exalted by an honour greater than the world ever saw, she still dwelt upon the foundation of humility." The Angel Gabriel "found in her a capacity and excellent disposition to receive the greatest honour that was ever done to the daughters of men. She was full of grace and excellencies; and God poured upon her a full measure of honour in making her the Mother of the Messias."* Bishop Pearson writes in still more glowing terms: "It was her own prediction, 'From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed;' but the obligation is ours, to call her, to esteem her so. If Elisabeth cried out with so loud a voice, 'Blessed art thou among women,' when Christ was but newly conceived in her womb; what expressions of honour and admiration can we think sufficient now that Christ is in heaven, and that Mother with Him! Far be it from any Christian to derogate from that special privilege granted her, *which is incommunicable to any other.* We cannot bear too reverend a regard unto the Mother of our Lord, so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the Lord Himself. Let us keep to the language of the Primitive Church: 'Let her be honoured and esteemed, let Him be worshipped and adored.'"†

The eighteenth century was not favourable to the development of Catholic sympathies. During that dreary period which followed the Revolution the efforts of our best divines were directed to the task of resisting the attacks of a subtle and dangerous Arianism. When the supreme divinity of our Lord was openly questioned, it was not to be expected that His Blessed Mother would be allowed her natural position in the order of grace. Still the ancient tradition was not left without a witness.

> "Pause where we may upon the desert road,
> Some shelter is in sight, some sacred safe abode."‡

It will be sufficient to adduce the following quotation from Robert Nelson, who lived at the beginning of the century: "The Blessed Virgin was most excellently disposed to receive the greatest honour that ever was done to the daughters of men; her employment being holy and pious, her body chaste, and her soul adorned with all virtues." §

* *Life of Christ.*
† *Exposition of the Creed*, Oxford Ed., 1857, Art. III. p. 319.
‡ *The Christian Year*, Advent Sunday.
§ *Fasts and Festivals*, Oxford Ed., 1843, pp. 139, 140.

The testimony of the nineteenth century is copious and decisive. We have already given the beautiful lines of Wordsworth; and, before we close these Lectures in an end, we shall have occasion to quote the no less beautifully expressed sentiments of the pious poet and learned Bishop of Brechin. We will at present refer to the late Mr. Isaac Williams, whose poem is in the Chronicles, and to the author of the "Christian Year." The former writes as follows:—"St. Mary was "so highly exalted above all of human race, and it may be among the greatest of God, that it is difficult almost for our thoughts to dwell upon her without wonder and reverence approaching to adoration." And these are the lines of Mr. Keble in "The Christian Year":—

"This shrine, thy modest home,
O Mother unblemished—
That shrine, if angels hemmed the skies,
Becomes the sinless child."*

"Ave Maria! blessed Maid!
Lily of Eden's fragrant shade,
Who can express the love
That mantled thee so pure and sweet,
Making thy heart a shelter meet
For Jesus' holy Dove?†

Ave Maria! Mother blest,
To whom, caressing and caressed,
Clings the Eternal Child:
Favoured beyond archangels' dream,
When first on thee with tenderest gleam
Thy new-born Saviour smiled:—

Ave Maria! thou whose name
All but adoring love may claim,
Yet may we reach thy shrine;
For He, thy Son and Saviour, vows
To crown all lowly lofty brows
With love and joy like thine."‡

And again, in the "Lyra Innocentium":—

"Thy vision—(whoso chides, may blame
The instinctive reachings of the altar-flame)
Shows thee above, in yon etherial air,
A holier Mother, rapt in more prevailing prayer." §

* The Nativity, p. 29.
† The Purification.
§ Orphanhood.
‡ The Annunciation.

It may, perhaps, be as well to add the following quotation from Mr. Burgon, Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford,—a writer of no Roman sympathies: "Is it possible to feel too much human reverence for one whom the 'Ancient of days' singled out from all His creatures for so great, so unparalleled an honour? More than that, you should seek to realize the solemn truth that in her, the act of our first mother was in a manner reversed; and the penalty done away: that in her person, we behold a Woman bringing joy to the whole human race; as in the person of Eve, we behold a Woman bringing a perpetual heritage of woe. This is no mere historical fact, much less a mere theological speculation."*

From the statements of the writers we have quoted—and the list, it should be remembered, extends over a period of upwards of 300 years—it will be evident to the unprejudiced mind that, even since the Reformation, the Church of England, if we may take the writings of some of her ablest sons as our authority, has never refused to acknowledge the special grace conferred on Mary, to recognise her incommunicable privileges, or to regard her with feelings of the intensest love. It involves no repugnancy to the Sacred Scriptures, no incongruity with the analogy of faith, no disloyalty to his Church, for an English Clergyman to give expression to the yearnings of his heart, and, as he recalls her lovely name, to join in the Angelic Salutation of the Mother of his God—"Hail, Mary! the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women."†

"Of course, between the perfection of God and the perfection of the noblest of His creatures, there is the gulf of infinity fixed. Between essential Sanctity, the Sanctity that is the same as Being, and the most exalted sanctity that is a gift, there can be no possible comparison. There can be no comparison between that which is the attribute of the Creator and the gift to the creature . . . .

"But on the other hand, viewed rightly and in the analogy of faith, the great honour bestowed on Mary, the recognition of her place in the order of grace, tends very directly to a proper estimate of the glory of God. As in Alpine scenes one can never estimate the vast distances and enormous magnitudes of the glorious objects by which we are surrounded, from the fact that we have no measure or power of comparison till we see some tree or human form, the comparative insignificance of which forms that measure: so it is with the infinitude of God. We ascend towards it through the contemplation

* *Short Sermons*, Second Series, No. 33. † S. Luke i. 28.

[illegible] Thus the Theme is the highest of them all, [illegible] her creation, add [illegible] maternity, exhaust all [illegible] conception and [illegible] when you have [illegible] greater. Thus she [illegible] rise to the [illegible] the infinitude of [illegible] the more complete [illegible]

[illegible] an objection. [illegible] Our Lady must, [illegible] Son. Men, it is [illegible] that the [illegible] is far too [illegible] devotion to the [illegible] ample time [illegible] alone, protest [illegible] the mind from [illegible] to cause it to [illegible] And this, as a matter of [illegible] in the Eastern as in the [illegible] asserted to the [illegible] in the devotions of the [illegible] exalted into [illegible]

[illegible] satisfactory answer. [illegible] which our minds must be restrained will [illegible] which may be [illegible] that an affectionate [illegible] engages in the [illegible] with less intensity of feeling than the [illegible] We acknowledge that [illegible] of the Second Table do not interfere with the [illegible] of the precepts of the First; for, as the Apostle [illegible] "If we love not our brother whom we have seen, how [illegible] God Whom we have not seen?"[illegible] It is similar [illegible] to the Saints. If we never fix our eyes on the [illegible] is reflected in them, how can we bear to gaze on [illegible] which streams from the Beatific Vision? And [illegible] us to expose the fallacy of the *à priori* reasoning [illegible] We do not allow that the Cultus of our Lady

[illegible] on the Thirty-nine Articles, vol. i. pp. 226, 227.
[illegible] 20.

has any tendency to cause the mind to *rest* in its affection for the creature. It is rather through the contemplation of the Saints that, as we have already observed, we are able to rise first to the Divine Humanity of our Lord, and thence to the infinitude of God. The appeal to facts is equally unfortunate. The Catholic denies that his devotion to the Saints interferes, even in the slightest degree, with the worship of his God. He reminds the objector that in every age of the Church, and in every Communion, those who have been most given to the Cultus of the Blessed Virgin have, at the same time, bowed down in lowliest adoration before the unapproachable majesty of their Incarnate Lord: and he points to the fact, which is as true as it is sad, that where men have refused to recognise the grandeur of *her* position in the order of grace, they have, at last, denied the supreme Divinity of her Son. The glory of their Lord is obscured, because His Mother has been kept in the background.

What, then, it may be asked, is our duty as English Churchmen? There can be but one answer to this question. If we really love our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and desire to promote His glory, we must strive to regain for His Blessed Mother that place in the affections of our fellow-countrymen which she held in the hearts of the Fathers of the Primitive Church. And we may do so in various ways. Her name should never pass our lips without some epithet of honour. Attention should be directed to the beauty of her life and character as depicted in the Sacred Narrative. The full significance of the majestic title, Θεοτόκος, the Mother of God, conferred on her at the great Council of Ephesus, should be explained. The due observance of the Festivals which the Church has appointed in her honour should be promoted. And, above all, in the retirement of our chambers we should learn to meditate upon her august prerogatives, and strive to realize in all their fulness the blessings which, through the obedience of that gentle Lady, have been given unto men in the Incarnation of the Son of God.

Art. XII.—RE-UNION WITH PROTESTANT DISSENTERS.

The longing for visible Re-union in the Christian Family is one of the most remarkable features in the great Church movement of the present day. The sympathies of the early Tractarians with the great Caroline divines, and with the non-jurors, naturally led to an anxious desire for intercourse and reconciliation with the great Eastern Church; but the same theological sympathies, together with the traditionary feud with the Pope, deeply ingrained in the English mind, kept them equally hostile to her Western sister. If any of the leaders of that movement did contemplate the possibility of re-union with the latter, he was careful to keep such opinions to himself, since the mere hint at any such possibility would have rendered him an object of suspicion, and, at once, would have destroyed his influence, not only with the public generally, but with his own party. The existence of the traditionary feud so completely influenced the theological mind, that even Dr. Newman confessed that he was accustomed to use the conventional language against Rome in his Sermons, without much inquiry on his part, but simply as being in accordance with the current of polemics under which he had been brought up. The *Union* newspaper was, we believe, the first periodical that dared to even hint at the consideration of the question; which is now formally and continually discussed and recommended by the Review in which this paper appears. Certainly, no one, twenty years ago, would have ventured to predict the change that has come over the mind of a large body of Churchmen, clerical and lay, within the last ten years. The existence of the A. P. U. C., and publications too numerous to mention, witness, in an unmistakable manner, the extent to which the longing for unity and Re-union extends. With the desire for the Re-union of the three great Branches of the Catholic Church there could not fail to spring up simultaneously an equally earnest wish to see the various bodies of Protestant Dissenters included in the general scheme.

Chancellor Massingberd, we believe, has the honour to be the first who tried to bring the subject formally before the Church. He has not succeeded, however, in inducing the Southern Convocation to take the initiative in the matter. Lord Lyttelton and his friends had better success at the Wolverhampton Church Congress last year; and this year the

Northern Convocation has actually taken up the matter. There seems, then, to be every probability that the subject will henceforth be one which will engage the attention of Churchmen. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the position which Dissenters occupy, the principles on which Dissent is based, should be clearly understood by us: as well as that Dissenters should be made clearly to comprehend those of the Church. For we may lay it down as a fact, that if Dissenters are ignorant of Church principles, Churchmen are even more ignorant of those which regulate Dissent. We read over very carefully the papers and speeches delivered at the Wolverhampton Congress, and we rose up from their perusal with the conviction that their authors had not only never studied the subject, but that they were completely in the dark as to what were the main points of difference between Dissenters and Churchmen. We venture to hope that the present article will throw a ray of light on this obscurity.

It will be sufficient for our purpose to divide Modern Dissenters into two groups, which we shall distinguish as the older and the later Nonconformists; those who separated from the Church in the times of the Reformation and the century immediately following, and those who separated in the last century. The first comprehends the Presbyterians, Anabaptists, and Independents; the latter the various Methodist communities. There are, of course, numbers of other sects, but it would be going too much into minutiæ to mention them; we are dealing with general principles, not with particular. The only exception to this division is the Society of Quakers, which deserves special consideration: though we shall find that Quakerism is really nothing more than carrying out the principles of the other sects to their logical conclusion.

The difference between the Church and Dissent is not so much a difference on certain abstract doctrines, as it is of the constitution of the body. In one sense it is a question of doctrine for it involves two Articles of the Creed, those, namely, of "one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church," and "one Baptism for the remission of sins." But these are doctrines in their concrete, rather than in their abstract, character. The real differences are those concerning the Constitution of the Church and her Ministry, and those on the nature of the Sacraments. The Dissenter denies that there is any visible Church, any ministry with a divine commission given by an outward Form; and that a Sacrament has any Divine Grace as a necessary part of it.

This is the present condition of Dissent: it was not so always with all classes: the Presbyterians, for instance, did hold most strongly, in the earlier stages of their existence, the necessity of something very like a regular succession; what they so strenuously denied was the Episcopal order; "parity of ministers" was what they contended for: but that ministry, they considered, must be ordained and set apart by imposition of hands and prayer; and that without this outward form, no one was qualified to administer the Sacraments. We have only to read over the authorized "Confession of Faith," the "Longer" and "Shorter" "Catechisms," of the Established Kirk of Scotland, to see that this was the belief of the earlier Presbyterians; we have only to talk to modern Presbyterian ministers to know how very far they have departed from the faith of their forefathers. It will not be of any importance to our present inquiry to look into the history of the past, or the departure of modern Dissenters from the principles of their founders; our inquiry at present is with what the modern Nonconformist considers as essentially wrong in the Church, and essentially right in his own community. We use the word "essentially" on purpose; we know there are many in the Church who think the differences between the Church and Dissent to be matters of minor importance, or non-essential; but the Dissenter does not so consider them: on the contrary, they are with him vital, the very essence of his religion. We shall speak of this at length further on in this article. Our inquiry, then, is into what we may call the concrete doctrines; those which take the outward form of the Visible Church.

And it is here, at once, that the difference appears: the Churchman believes in the Visible Church, the Dissenter does not; he believes in what he terms an "Invisible Church;" the company of those predestined to final salvation, but known only to God. The exigencies of the Calvinistic theory of predestination necessitated this doctrine: they could not deny the existence of "the Church," consistently with believing the numerous declarations about it in Scripture: neither were they prepared to acknowledge the Medieval Church as "the Church," for they had declared as an article of faith, that Rome was the Babylon of prophecy, and none of those in her could be saved; accordingly they invented the doctrine of an "Invisible Church." Readers of Hooker will remember how severely he was called to task for having said, "I doubt not but God was merciful to save thousands of our fathers, living in Popish superstition, inasmuch as they

sinned ignorantly;" and they will remember his defence of these words in section xxxvi. of his "Discourse of Justification." Believing, then, as they did in the impossibility of salvation in the Visible Church for many centuries, and yet unwilling to say that there was ever a time when there was no Church, they invented the doctrine of the Invisible Church. Even this was not sufficient for their purpose; for they would have to suppose that members of the Invisible Church lived in communion with Antichrist; so they went further to express a belief in a visible Church. "The Visible Church, which is also Catholic, is universal under the Gospel, (not confined to one nation, as before under the law,) consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." (Westminster Confession of Faith, c. xxv.) How this differs from the "Invisible Church," as described in the preceding section as "the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be, gathered into one, under Christ the Head thereof," it is not easy to see. But when any truth is denied, can we expect to find consistency? The exigencies of their position again required some device to uphold a perpetually Visible Church; accordingly they hunted up Waldenses, Bohemian brethren, and even those horrible Manichæans the Albigenses, to figure as a part of a perpetually visible body. The various sects, however, have each of them ever had a strong inclination to set themselves up as the one only true Church, and have tried to keep up the semblance of perfection by excluding unworthy members. The Presbyterians and Independents did make immense efforts to effect this in the seventeenth century, when they used most unscrupulously the civil arm to enforce what they called Church censures; but the tyranny soon proved itself unbearable, and was gradually relinquished: the edifice built up fell by its own weight. Many of the minor sects still go on trying to form a "perfect Church," after their own model, in which all members are perfect, but with equal unsuccess. The last we heard of styles its members "Peculiar People:" they were brought into public notice by being summoned before one of the London police magistrates for allowing the child of one of their members to die without calling in medical aid.

It will be most convenient to take the points of difference between the Church and Dissent separately, and show wherein lie the really antagonistic principles: we shall then come to a clear understanding of the grounds on which reconciliation is

possible or impossible. We shall state the doctrine of the Church only to contrast it with that of modern dissent: we shall leave altogether untouched those doctrines in which they agree with us. Our inquiry is, of course, confined to those bodies incongruously termed "Orthodox Dissenters," which means those who agree with the Catholic Faith in the fundamental doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation and Atonement.

The points of difference are: I. The Visible Church; II. The Ministry; III. The Sacraments.

I. The modern Dissenter believes in an Invisible Church, composed of those only who will be finally saved; but, inasmuch as these persons can be known to God alone, the doctrine is of no practical importance, and may at once be dismissed as irrelevant to our subject. He denies entirely that there is any one community to which the term in the Creed can be applied "one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church:" that of all the Christian communities now existing, there is any one which has been exclusively founded by Christ, of whose ministry He is the Author, and which alone has the right to administer His Sacraments. He believes in *Christianity*, as a divine system, but he does not believe in one divine Body, the Church. Consequently he believes that individuals accept the doctrines of Christianity, and then form themselves into voluntary associations for the purpose of maintaining those doctrines, and for the worship of God. These associations must be formed on the model which each sect supposes to be laid down in the New Testament, with a certain latitude for private opinion. Thus Methodists are, in their form, oligarchical; Independents, democratic; but they will acknowledge each other as portions of what they call "The Church." Each of these bodies is "*A* Church," perfect and complete in itself, independent of other bodies; but they believe that these various bodies are portions of what they call "*The* Church."

Thus what they call the Visible Church is a congeries of sects, under different forms of government, some oligarchical, some democratic; with one only definite bond of union, belief in the Bible as the revelation of God to man. We ought perhaps to add the use of two of the Sacraments as outward forms only, together with another form in the appointment of a minister: but these are not considered as "generally necessary to salvation." In speaking of this idea of the Church as a congeries of sects, there are certain bodies which the Dissenter does not include in that term; for instance, the Greek

and Roman branches of the Church; the latter, if not the former, he considers to be, as the founders of his sect did, the Babylon of the Apocalypse. In one respect he is a little more tolerant; for he thinks that, though the Church of Rome is the kingdom of Antichrist, yet it is possible that some in her communion may be saved. The Independent and Baptist seem almost to believe that connection with the State vitiates the claim to be *a* Church, in the case of the Church of England and the Kirk of Scotland.

The idea, then, of the meaning of the article of the Creed, "one Holy Catholic Church," is totally different from the idea that the Church holds of herself; consequently the doctrine of the Dissenter on this article is not only different from the Catholic doctrine, but subversive of it. The Catholic doctrine is that Christ established a kingdom, organised its government, gave supernatural powers to its officers, and moreover that He then called and still does call into that body whom He will; so that this kingdom or body is the ἐκκλησία, the body of those called, of the elect; and that the admission to that body is the Sacrament of Baptism; that this body is visible and perpetual; that all privileges and promises are made to it; and that it alone possesses spiritual authority to declare what the true faith is, and to decide in matters of dispute. The Dissenter, on the other hand, denies that there is any one body so constituted: he believes in a divine system of doctrine and revelation, as given in the New Testament, but he maintains that each one can interpret those Scriptures for himself. He holds that each community is a voluntary association of men believing in Christianity who have the right to organize themselves as they please: that there is no divine organization of the Church, other than men, exercising their private judgment, think they can gather from the New Testament. In the Established Kirk of Scotland there is still held, theoretically, that is, in the authorised documents, though now, probably, never insisted upon, that its order of government is divine; in England this was formally given up in 1691, when the English Presbyterians entered into articles of agreement with the Independents. The first article is, "That each particular Church has a right to choose its own officers, and hath authority from Christ for exercising government," &c. This formally gives up the *jus divinum* of Presbyterian rule.

The idea, then, which the older Nonconformists have of "the Church" is this: that each community is a perfect "Church" of itself; that all power and authority lies in the congregation; the congregation chooses its officers, the Pastor

[illegible] that authority the [illegible] them. The Pastor [illegible] the Deacons or Elders [illegible].

[illegible] the various sects of [illegible] the supreme power is [illegible] it is composed wholly [illegible] by themselves; [illegible] of each Conference fill [illegible]. In the New Con- [illegible] of the members of Conference is in the [illegible] congregation, with about one [illegible] minister and one [illegible] in the system of election different [illegible] the Wesleyan, but there is also a large infusion [illegible].

[illegible] essential idea and doctrine of "The Church" [illegible] different from that which Catholics hold, no less so is [illegible] of the Ministry. The modern Dissenter has no [illegible] at all that any divine gift is bestowed in Ordination. [illegible] English Presbyterian who did believe in Ordination [illegible] this belief in 1861. From that time he agrees [illegible] the Independent and the Baptist, that self-consciousness [illegible] makes a man a minister, while the appointment by the [illegible] gives him all the outward authority that he needs: [illegible] of laying on of hands is merely the acknowledge- [illegible] of his being already a minister, and a sort of certificate [illegible] to the congregation. In Scotland, the Free Kirk- [illegible] goes further. Let this upon the election by the congre- [illegible] is absolutely necessary. It was upon this point that [illegible] in 1843 took place: he says plainly that the [illegible] of lay-patrons to nominate a person to the charge of [illegible] is a denial of the Headship of Christ.

[illegible] seems, of course, to us as absolutely absurd; [illegible] must put ourselves, as far as we can, into the Dissent- [illegible] before we judge of their motives and acts. [illegible] to them—we are speaking of the older Noncon- [illegible] all power and authority lies in the congregation; [illegible] no Apostolic succession, no divine gift in ordina- [illegible] order of Priesthood, all authority and power lies with [illegible] each "believer" is a priest; the universal priest- [illegible] of believers is an essential doctrine. The "minister" [illegible] teacher; nay, he is almost the servant of the con- [illegible] the congregation can at any time depose him. To [illegible] a teacher forced upon them by a lay-patron, who [illegible] of another communion—as is frequently the case

in the Established Kirk of Scotland—is to annihilate the rights of the congregation, the real seat of all power: consequently, it is a dethronement of Christ the Head. English Dissenters do not go so far as this, but they are all equally agreed that the congregation has the sole right to appoint its pastor.

Among the later Nonconformists, the various sects of Methodists, the congregation is not consulted, nor has it any voice in the choice of its pastor. The candidate for the "ministry" is presented to the Conference, and the whole matter is in their hands. They not only ordain, but they appoint the congregation over which the "minister" is to preside: they have absolute right to remove a "minister" from one place to another. Though the members of the Conference "ordain," yet they do not consider that the laying on of hands confers any gift: it is a mere form, certifying their approbation of the individual, and confirming their choice. The first requisite is that the candidate be a "converted" man, since no gifts of God can be conceived to belong to one unconverted. The second is, that he possess already the gifts necessary for the office, for nothing is given in ordination. Accordingly they are asked, 1st. "Do they know God as a pardoning God? Have they the love of God, &c.? 2nd. Have they *gifts* (*sic*) (as well as grace) for the work, &c.? 3rd. Have they *fruit?* (*sic.*) Are any truly convinced of sin and converted to God by their preaching?" It is added: "As long as these *three marks* (*sic*) concur in any one, we believe he is called of God to preach. These we receive as sufficient proof that he is moved thereto by the Holy Ghost." (*Large Minutes*, p. 35.) Now since each candidate is required to testify to his own conversion, and to his own experiences, and to his own gifts; and, upon the account of these matters which he gives for himself, he is appointed to the ministry, it is plain that a large field is open for self-deceit: indeed, it is difficult to contrive a plan more exactly fitted to encourage hypocrisy and self-delusion.

We have probably said enough to show how entirely the modern Dissenter ignores, or rather renounces, the Catholic doctrine of ordination, as well as the existence of the Priesthood as a Divine Order, with Divine gifts of authority and power.

III. We need say little on the third point, the Sacraments; there does not seem to be a trace left of any belief in "an inward and spiritual grace" as a *part* of the Sacrament; the latter is a mere outward form, signifying, but not conveying, spiritual grace. Grace may follow the outward sign, but it is

not united to it: its presence depends on the state of mind of the recipient, and not on the appointment of Christ. The Baptists have carried this idea of the Sacrament the furthest of all: for not only do they delay the administration till late in life, but many of their Communion are not baptized at all: we have known men and women who have lived consistent lives as members of that sect up to seventy and eighty years of age, depart without ever being baptized at all: and yet treated in all respects as Christians. In Scotland too, among Presbyterians, this Sacrament is fearfully neglected: it is computed that in large towns one-third of the Presbyterian children are unbaptized. In America the proportion is still greater. In the former country we have been credibly informed that persons are admitted to the Lord's Supper who have never been baptized.

Indeed it becomes difficult for us to understand why infant baptism is retained in any of these sects, since they do not believe that any spiritual benefit is conferred upon the child baptized; like their so-called ordination, it is a mere outward sign of admission into the society: it is the exact counterpart of circumcision: a return, in fact, to the "beggarly elements" of the Law "which perish with the using." To our eyes, Quakerism, which rejects all outward form, is far more consistent: for surely it is one of the distinguishing features of the new covenant that it introduced a system of divine grace in the place of mere external signs: consequently, if Sacraments be merely outward signs, containing no grace, they can have no place in the Gospel.

The statements made above will point out to us the extreme difficulty, and great improbability, of any reunion of Dissenters as a body with the Church: for it is not a mere difference of opinion on certain minor matters of persons who hold substantially the same Faith, but—as regards the Church, and let it be remembered, that the schism is entirely on three points which concern this idea of the Church—the difference is fundamental. To understand it we must put ourselves into the position which a Dissenter occupies; we must realize his ideas; we must view the matter through his spectacles; and then we shall be in a condition to pronounce a judgment on the matter. We shall find two co-ordinate ideas governing the whole of their belief: 1st, that the promises of God are made to individuals, in opposition to the idea that there is any divinely constituted corporate body, which we understand by the Church; and 2nd, that each individual "believer" is a priest, in the sense of excluding any divinely appointed order

Priesthood. These principles are put forward by the older nconformists as not only indisputable, but vital; quite as ch so as the opposite are to Catholics. From this stand-nt the whole Church system is a renouncing of the order Christ, and a setting up something of human invention in its ce. To try to confute a Dissenter by asking him, "Where the Church from the time of the Apostles to the rise of the wnists?" is simply to beat the air: he has no idea of any cession, still less of the need of it; his system does not d a perpetually Visible Church: his whole concern is led in the individual, irrespective of a ministry as a visible y. He only unites into a community for the sake of tual benefit, he never pretends that his community is alone Visible Church. In this respect there is little or no erence between the older and the later nonconformists; h hold the doctrine of universal priesthood as fundamental; government of the sect is quite a secondary matter; the class prefers a democratic constitution, the other oligarchic; h believes his own form to be Scriptural, but neither to be ential.

We cannot, therefore, hold out hopes of a return of any t *en masse* to the Church: though of the two, the Wesleyan thodists are by far the most accessible body; but we do l out very strong hopes of individual conversion. The ter of this article has had opportunities of becoming nainted with the feelings of many Nonconformists of erent denominations, as well as with their publications, and can say that very many of not the least eminent of different bodies are becoming daily more dissatisfied with ir position. Works written by members of the Anglo-holic school of theology are very generally read by the e thoughtful of all sects, ministers and others: the two es of "The Church and the World" are among this class. Pan-Anglican synod has done more than anything else to ipate the false notions that were entertained about the nection of Church and State. No more important step can taken to give Dissenters a right understanding on the trine of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and lissipate their false conceptions, than the consecration of orthodox Bishop of Natal. We can assure our readers t there are many who are watching our movements with an rest second only to our own in this matter: the con-ation of a Bishop to Natal to supersede a heretic ointed by Letters Patent from the Crown, following on his osition by a purely spiritual Court, under a Metropolitan

who ignores the Royal Supremacy, will do more to explain to the more thoughtful of the Dissenters the Catholic doctrines of the Holy Catholic Church, and the Apostolic Succession, than thousands of controversial volumes; and the very boldness of the act, the independence of civil authority and permission, will tend to win their hearts and sympathies far beyond any formal proposal of reunion.

With respect to absorption into the Church, we think we may entertain greater hopes of the Wesleyans than of any other body. Many of the more eminent ministers have their sons educated for the priesthood of the Church: the late Dr. Hannah is an instance, and he died in communion with the Church. How far the Conference would entertain any proposal such as that made at the York Convocation it is impossible for us to guess, but we do think that some such proposal is due from us: and that no body is so well calculated to make it as the Convocation of the Northern Province: for, with the exception of Wales and Cornwall, and perhaps Lincoln, nowhere does Methodism so prevail as in it. Nor should we allow any feelings of pride or false shame to keep us back from being the first to offer friendship and peace: for a large debt is due from us. It was the fault of the Church, or rather of the bishops and clergy of the last century, that we have any Methodism at all: the clergy refused to evangelise the people, and left it to the Methodists to do it for them. Let us frankly acknowledge this by an honest and manly offer of reconciliation: if the Conference reject the offer, then at least we have done our part, and tried to heal an acknowledged sore. We cannot say that we entertain any strong hope that such advances on our part will lead to any immediate results; but it is a duty, a Christian act, which cannot fail to bring a blessing on those who do it. We look, however, far more to the steady working of Catholic principles in parishes and districts; to hearty choral worship, and to earnest preaching of the Faith. Wherever these have been in operation, there have the Methodists been attracted to Church; and were this means more used than it is in the North, we feel assured that a gradual absorption of the more earnest of Dissenters of all denominations would inevitably follow. As learning and information increase, and as Catholic literature is more and more diffused, and Catholic principles more understood, so we may expect to see a movement towards the Church among the Dissenters. Men of real learning and abilities, of refined taste and habits, can find nothing congenial in the Dissenting Ministry. The author of *Salem Chapel*

has painted us a picture, and a perfectly true one, of the misery and bondage to which an Independent minister is subject from the more influential of his congregation: we do know some ministers who have retired from active duty from an inability to endure this slavery. Methodists, who are not dependent on the vote of the congregation, are no doubt in this respect in a far better position; but there are other causes, which make their post anything but desirable to a man of high attainments or refined feelings.

What is really most wanted is an accurate knowledge of the principles of Dissent on the part of Churchmen, and of the Church on the part of Dissenters. The ignorance on both sides is very great: consequently when writers on the one side publish their thoughts and opinion of the other, they are perfectly inconclusive and unconvincing. A set of short treatises, not controversial, but clearly stating the case between the Church and each sect in simple language, in a kindly tone, would, we believe, be of very great benefit. We deprecate controversy, as bringing in personal feeling, and tending in many cases to make the most of minor points, and to leave untouched the real question at issue. We feel sure that as Nonconformists become more acquainted with the distinctive principles of the Catholic Church, arrive at a better knowledge of Catholic doctrine, and are induced to attend Catholic worship, the truth and beauty of the Kingdom of Christ will force themselves upon them, and individuals will become attracted into it. We do not expect any general conversion of the body, but we do expect that large numbers, especially the young, will be led to embrace the truth.

Art. XIII.—CARDINAL HOWARD.

To a mind imbued with the love of spiritual reading, the life of an earnest and high-born Religious, however secluded, cannot fail to have a special interest, but in the case of Father Philip Thomas Howard, of Norfolk, this interest is enhanced by the fact of his having taken an active part in civil and ecclesiastical affairs during the reigns of Charles II. and James II., and having infused fresh life into the Dominican order in this country. The terms in which he is introduced to our notice by Lord Macaulay are sufficient to excite our curiosity respecting him; and recent research has brought to light many facts in his history which deserve to be recorded. In speaking of the Englishmen who resided at the Court of Innocent XI., Macaulay says:

"Of these the most illustrious was Philip Howard, sprung from the noblest houses of Britain, grandson, on one side, of an Earl of Arundel, on the other, of a Duke of Lennox. Philip had long been a member of the sacred college: he was commonly designated as the Cardinal of England; and he was the chief counsellor of the Holy See in matters relating to his country. He had been driven into exile by the outcry of Protestant bigots; and a member of his family, the unfortunate Stafford, had fallen a victim to their rage. But neither the Cardinal's own wrongs, nor those of his house, had so heated his mind as to make him a rash adviser. Every letter, therefore, which went from the Vatican to Whitehall recommended patience, moderation, and respect for the prejudices of the English people."*

Philip (Thomas), third son of Lord Henry Howard, was born at Arundel House, in the parish of S. Clement Danes, in the year 1629,† when disputes were raging high between Charles I. and his Parliament. His education was controlled by his grandfather, the Earl of Arundel, who with inconsistency frequent at that period, had conformed to the Church of England ten years after the Gunpowder Plot, yet allowed his children and grandchildren to be brought up in the religion of the Church of Rome. In Italy itself the Earl lived and died in a doubtful character as regards his creed; and Philip, afterwards the Cardinal, though instructed in turn by Anglican and Roman Catholic tutors, though entered, as it appears, Fellow Commoner of S. John's, Cambridge, evinced from the first

* *History of England*, chap. iv. † September 21.

a strong leaning to the Roman discipline and theology, and was imbued with so much piety that his grandfather used to call him his Bishop while yet a boy. The numerous high offices held by the Earl in the Court of Charles I. lead us to suspect that political motives led him to play fast and loose with the Faith which was, and is to this day, traditional in his family. When Strafford had been beheaded, and the Great Rebellion was on the point of breaking out, Lord Arundel was appointed by the King to conduct the mother of Queen Henrietta Maria to a place of safety on the continent;* and the flame of civil war, which soon spread through England, prevented his ever returning. In 1644, when the Royal forces were signally and repeatedly routed, Lord Arundel was made Earl of Norfolk; and his prolonged residence in the Low Countries, and journeys through France and Italy, afforded Philip (who with his brothers had been forced to fly from England) an opportunity of seeing the Roman Catholic religion in all its varied forms of activity and splendour. Such was his ardour, that he would have joined the Carmelite friars in Antwerp at once, if the fondness of his parents and grandfather had not induced him to forego the severe delights of the cloister for a season.

When at Milan, Philip Howard became acquainted with an Irish Dominican named Hackett, to whom he opened his heart, and declared his intention of embracing as soon as possible a monastic life. Father Hackett advised him, of course, to do nothing hastily, and to rest assured that if such were really his vocation, God would make his way clear in answer to prayer, and convert apparent obstacles into means of accomplishing his design. Philip then proceeded on his travels with the Earl, but returning before long to Milan, he again avowed to Father Hackett his fixed resolution to enter the Dominican Order. He pined for a religious life, and his affections warmed towards that great society of Friar-Preachers which had planted the Cross on every shore of the habitable world, and watered it copiously with the blood of its martyred members.† He knew how its missionary, Gilbert de Fresnoy, had visited England four hundred years before his time, and had, under the auspices of Henry III., been received everywhere with marks of favour by the clergy and the people. He remembered how, in England and Wales only, fifty-two convents of Dominicans were founded in eighty-one years,

* Agnes Strickland's *Queens of England*, vol. viii. p. 81.
† Lacordaire. *Life of St. Dominic.* Dublin, 1851.

and that of these one of the earliest was built at Arundel, and endowed by one of the Earls of Arundel, from whose loins he sprang. He thought of their zeal in preaching in portable pulpits, at public crosses, and in market-places; of their confessionals and retreats; of their deep study of the Scriptures; of their commentaries and concordances, their skill in medicine, their love of the fine-arts, and their taste in poetry.* Constantly they had been concerned in affairs of State. They had given confessors to Henry III., Edward I., Edward II., and Edward III. Richard II. had used the divine office according to their rite. Henry VI. made a Dominican his confessor, and two sons of Edward IV. were born in their house at Shrewsbury. Catherine of Aragon's first confessor was a Dominican; and when Henry VIII. broke with the Holy See to indulge his passions, and substituted his own supremacy for that of Rome, the Friar-Preachers in general preferred beggary, imprisonment, exile or death to conformity with the will of a monster of rapacity and lust. John Hopton, indeed, remained in England as confessor to the Princess Mary, afterwards Queen, and during her reign a scattered remnant of his Order was restored to the priory of S. Bartholomew, in Smithfield, and the nunnery at Dartford. But their reprieve was short. The passing-bell for Queen Mary was the knell also of the English Dominicans. Though Elizabeth at first outwardly professed the Roman Catholic faith, she soon suspended the elevation of the Host, ordered communion to be given in both kinds, decreed herself supreme Governor of the Church of England, and gave her royal assent to the Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer. The Dominicans who refused to conform were driven beyond the seas, and those of them who ventured to return were tracked as if by bloodhounds from one place of concealment to another. James I. yielded to the spirit of the times, and in 1604 appointed a commission for banishing Catholic missionaries from England. Many Englishmen, however, from time to time, repaired to religious houses on the continent and there joined the Order of S. Dominic; some returned to their native land attached to foreign embassies; and some, after ministering to their fellow-countrymen in disguise, were brought to trial and sealed their faith with their blood.

The remembrance of this painful history increased Philip Howard's longing to enrol his name in the Order of Blackfriars. Accordingly, on the 28th of June, 1645, he assumed

* Echard. *Scriptoris Ordinis Prædicatorum*, 1719-21. Marchese. *Painters, Sculptors, and Architects of the Order of St. Dominic.* Dublin, 1852.

the religious habit at Cremona, and took the name of Thomas out of devotion to the Angelic Doctor.* With this bold step his troubles began. The Earl of Arundel's pride was wounded, and his affection, as he thought, for Philip was outraged. Every mean was employed to reverse the pious decision of the novice. The Pope himself, Innocent X., was applied to, and by his orders the young Howard was removed to Milan, and questioned long and seriously by the Cardinal Archbishop of that See as to the reasons which had led him to embrace a monastic life. The more strictly Philip was interrogated, the more clear it became that he was called of God. He looked for no earthly reward: he knew that in every place, if he returned to England, bonds and afflictions would await him. Yet he desired above all things to do this, that he might save his own soul and haply some of his brethren's also. Many schemes having failed to thwart the will of Heaven in this respect, Father Howard was at last withdrawn from the Dominicans and placed with the Oratorians of S. Philip Neri at Rome. But neither the tears of his grandfather † nor the arguments of his brother availed to break his resolution, and being at length brought before the Pope, his prudent and ready answers convinced his Holiness of the reality of his vocation. On the 18th of October, 1646, he subscribed his solemn profession at the Dominican Convent of S. Sixtus, being then little more than seventeen years old. There is nothing in the Communion to which he belonged which rivets the attention and excites the wonder more than the clearness with which souls are called to religious lives and the firmness with which they insist on obeying the call in spite of every domestic and social obstacle.

During four years Father Howard devoted himself to study in the Convent called La Sanità, at Naples. Not long after leaving Rome, he heard of his grandfather's death; and when he visited the imperial city again, it was because he was sent thither to deliver the Latin oration before the Fathers on the occasion of their electing another head of the Order. He was a young man to address an august assembly, but his enthusiasm was so tempered by prudence that he acquitted himself of his task admirably. He pleaded for his distracted country, desolated by civil war, deprived of all regular government,‡ lost to the Church, and overrun by fanatics and Puritans. He earnestly prayed that a seminary might be

* Fr. Raymond Palmer's *Life of Cardinal Howard*, p. 82.
† Evelyn's *Diary at Padua*, 1646. ‡ A.D. 1650.

founded by the Dominican Order for the instruction of English youths, and that missionaries might thus be prepared to preach to England anew the faith of S. Augustine and Aidan. His appeal was not fruitless. In 1652 he was ordained a priest by dispensation, being only twenty-three years old, and was sent to finish his studies at Rennes in Bretagne, that he might there receive and succour the Catholics who fled from persecution under Cromwell's rule. There were circumstances, however, which made Belgium more eligible for his pious purpose; and he therefore spent much time and trouble in attempting to found a Dominican convent there, such as might operate on England as occasion presented itself. He also revisited his native land during the Protectorate of Cromwell, and even recovered by law seven years' arrears of rent due to him from the Earl of Lincoln, who occupied the castle of Folkingham, in Lincolnshire. The yearly rent of it was 97*l.* 10*s.* 10½*d.*, and belonged to Father Howard as part of his patrimony. With this resource and with subscriptions raised among his friends and relatives, Father Howard returned to Belgium, cheered by brighter hopes of effecting his long-cherished design.* Cromwell was by this time at the height of his power, and was performing the solemn farce of declining the Crown he durst not accept.

Between Antwerp and Aalst, in East Flanders, the castle of Bornhem, in the sixteenth century, rose in the midst of swamps, and when the floods were out could be approached only by boats. Peter Coloma, the Baron, began to form sluices and to erect a small church and convent there in 1601. Pious observances, it was thought, would dispel the hideous spectres and hobgoblins with which the place was infested, and enable the poor neighbours to go abroad again in the dark. The Baron, too, possessed a relic of the Holy Cross which he was anxious to enshrine worthily. When built, however, the convent had no abiding tenants. Various disputes and difficulties arose, so that at last, in 1656, when Peter Coloma's grandson succeeded to the title, Father Howard was able to treat with him for the building. In the autumn of the following year all the arrangements were concluded, the sanction of the Spanish Government was secured, and Father Howard, with his "poor exiled English Religious of the Order of S. Dominic," became the first prior of the Convent of Bornhem. Six brothers only joined him in the outset, but these submitted patiently to numberless privations. The buildings were in

* About May, 1657. Fr. Palmer's *Life*, p. 97.

wretched repair; the shattered windows were stuffed with straw, and the rooms roughly separated with boards. By degrees the place assumed a more hospitable appearance, and other Englishmen resorted to it, that their lives might be more completely hidden with Christ in God. There, in the dismal marshy land, their prayers for England's conversion went up continually before the Lord, and their time would have passed peacefully, if the Baroness of Bornhem had not harassed the holy brethren during twenty years by asserting her right as foundress to enter the cloister with her friends or servants whenever she pleased. This claim Father Howard resisted, as contrary to the rules of his Order, though quite consistent with the rules of some others; and thus a wearisome conflict was keep up between the cloister and the castle.

After the defeat of the Scots under Charles II. at Worcester,* the Prince, landing at Fescamp,† proceeded to Rouen and thence to Paris. After some years, while a treaty was on foot between Cromwell and Louis XIV., he withdrew to Cologne, and subsequently to Brussels. Here Father Howard often visited him, and was always cordially received. The Prince had a well-known leaning towards the Roman Catholic Faith, and even in the midst of his profligacy cultivated that acquaintance with its doctrines which issued in his being received into the Roman Church on his death-bed. He sincerely respected Father Howard, and when Cromwell died, just seven years after his victory at Worcester, the Prince fixed on him as the fittest person to send to England on a secret service. With him was united a certain Rookwood, a convert who had been a Jesuit, and was now a Carthusian. The Prince was taken by his engaging address, and persisted in sending him with Father Howard, though he was warned of his duplicity. It was about May, 1659, when they received their commission, but Father Howard, being aware of his colleague's treacherous character, contrived to give him the slip and make a detour by way of Zeeland. The crafty Rookwood was no sooner arrived in England than he went straight to Richard Cromwell, then Protector, and betrayed Howard as the bearer of important messages from Prince Charles to the Royalists. A warrant was immediately issued for his apprehension, and he would certainly have been arrested soon

* September 3, 1651. Fr. Palmer in his *Life of Cardinal Howard* gives 1650 as the date of the battle of Worcester. He seems better read in Chronicles of his Order than in Burnet, Clarendon, and Whitlocke.

† October 22, 1651. Miss Strickland. *Life of Henrietta Maria*, p. 191.

after his arrival in London, if the Polish ambassador, who was then leaving the country, had not disguised him as a Pole, and brought him to Belgium as one of his suite.

Rookwood's subsequent career is curious. Sir George Booth was rising in Cheshire in favour of King Charles,* and the Prince himself was reported to be in England. Through Rookwood's information the plans of the Royalists were disconcerted. General Lambert was sent down to Cheshire with 20,000 men; Sir George's forces were surprised and scattered, while he himself was captured and lodged in the Tower. Rookwood was handsomely rewarded by the Protector, but when Charles II. was recalled to his kingdom in May, 1660, he was arrested and sent for correction to his convent. He managed, however, to escape to Holland, and thence to Heidelburg, where the quondam Jesuit turned Protestant again, and taught Calvinism from the pulpit. He married, of course, for such adventurers are generally in high favour with widows and maidens, and his bride procured for him from the Palatine the embassy to England which her former husband, a German colonel, had discharged. Disgusted with this offensive appointment, Charles II. refused to see the renegade and traitor. He ordered him to leave the country immediately, and in 1673, while Rookwood was defending one of the Palatine's fortresses, he was slain by the French, and thus ended his disgraceful career.

Father Howard was once more safe at Bornhem. He placed in its library a book of devotions splendidly illuminated, and written about 1475. It was thought worthy of notice in several magazines,† and bears a memorandum to this effect:

Conventus Anglo-Bornhemiensis, dono-datus ab Emmo. Dno. Cardinali de Norfolciâ fundatore ejusdem Conventus, 1659.

He had probably received it from his mother or some one of his family, and brought it with him when he escaped out of the toils of Richard Cromwell's government. About the same time he established a College at Bornhem in connection with the convent for educating English Catholic youths. In the years 1659 and 1660 six students repaired to it, and among them was Father Howard's youngest brother.

While at Brussels, Charles II. had frequently declared that, if he should regain his throne, he would marry a Roman Catholic.‡ In this he kept his word, but we cannot see that

* Bishop Burnet's *History*, vol. i.

† *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1789, 1790. *Archæological Journal*, No. 45.

‡ Fr. Palmer's *Life*, p. 119.

he was actuated by much principle in the affair. He had been attached to the Princess Henrietta, daughter of Frederick Henry, Prince of Orange. Their regard was mutual, but the Princess's mother having repelled his suit when his fortunes were low, he disdained renewing his demand when raised to the throne.* He then treated for a Princess of Parma, whom Spain was to enrich with a dowry; but Louis XIV. and King Charles's mother, Queen Henrietta, suggested Catharine of Braganza, the infanta of Portugal;† and the dowry of half a million sterling, together with Tangier and Bombay, and free trade in Brazil and the East Indies, were to the King of England offers too tempting to admit of the least hesitation. Father Howard actively promoted the marriage treaties both with Spain and Portugal, being, like Louis XIV. and Queen Henrietta Maria, desirous of seeing the King's affections fixed on a Roman Catholic. It was not difficult to turn Charles's choice in that direction, for when some of the lords of his council suggested several German Princesses, the King exclaimed: "Odds fish! they are all dull and foggy; I cannot like any one of them for a wife." ‡

Father Howard's time was now divided between Belgium and England. He founded a nunnery for English ladies at Vilvorde, and his cousin Antonia Howard was the first Englishwoman who took the habit of S. Dominic "since the unhappy fall of religion in England." He enlarged the convent at Bornhem, and rendered the secular college more efficient.

But the marriage of Charles II. with Catharine of Braganza was the occasion of withdrawing Father Howard from the cloister to a court. The nuptial ceremony was performed twice. Catharine was earnestly entreated to dispense with the Roman rite, but she declared that she would return to Portugal rather than forego it; and accordingly she was married in her bedchamber by Lord Aubigny, her chief almoner. Mrs. Fitzherbert was not so scrupulous when she married the Prince of Wales. Though a Roman Catholic, she insisted on no other ministration than that of an Anglican clergyman.§ Catharine of Braganza was publicly married by the Bishop of London, and the Lord Chancellor did not even know of the private ceremony.‖ A

* Agnes Strickland's *Life of Catharine of Braganza*, pp. 273—275.

† Carte's *Life of the Duke of Ormond.*

‡ Ibid.

§ Jesse's *Life of George III.* vol. ii. p. 506. Langdale's *Life of Mrs. Fitzherbert.*

‖ *Autobiography of James II.* in Macpherson's Collection.

separate ecclesiastical establishment was assigned to her, that she might freely practise her religion, and Father Howard became her first chaplain through the influence of his uncle, Lord Aubigny. This appointment obliged him to reside constantly at the English Court, but his heart was never weaned from the quiet community which he had left at Bornhem, and he visited it regularly every year.

His services in the royal household of Catharine were much prized; the Queen wrote in his praise to the General of his Order, and a warm friendship sprang up between him and a Portuguese Dominican, who was her Majesty's confessor. He was charged also with providing two Religious for a small Dominican convent in Tangier, and this with a view to instructing the Irish soldiers stationed on the spot.

When Lord Aubigny died, in 1665, Father Howard was appointed to succeed him as Grand Almoner to the Queen. He had a state apartment; superintended Catharine's Oratory at Whitehall, received a yearly salary of £500, with an equal sum for his table, and £100 for the expenses of the chapel. He was addressed as "My Lord Almoner." Pepys once visited him at S. James's, and describes him as "a good-natured gentleman who was brother of the Duke of Norfolk." His room appeared larger and lighter than it was, owing to its numerous looking-glasses. He had a moveable desk fastened to the arm of his chair, and he chatted merrily about differences of religion, calling the Pope "Antichrist" by way of jest.* But however he might smile and joke with strangers, Father Howard must have suffered much inward distress. The cruel neglect with which his royal mistress was treated by the King, the presence of her shameless rivals, the insults they offered to the virtuous Catharine, the tears she shed over the utter profanity and profligacy of the Court, must have stirred the soul of her Almoner to its depths, and removed from him very far the hope of England's conversion. The fact of the Queen continuing childless must have grieved him as it afflicted her, because it helped to alienate the King's wayward affection, and made Catharine in the royal palace more desolate than a widow. †

Yet Father Howard seems, amid trying circumstances, to have conducted himself with great prudence. In April, 1667, he left England as one of the Ambassadors extraordinary sent to re-establish peace between this country and the United Pro-

* Pepys's *Diary*, Jan. 23rd, 1667.
† Miss Strickland's *Life of Catharine of Braganza*, p. 405.

vinces. The embassy of which he formed part, made a public entry into Breda on the 21st of May, and the conference, which began in the castle on the 8th of June, lasted three weeks. The peace was signed on July 23rd, and proclaimed in London with great solemnity on the 24th of August.

Father Howard's life about this time was strangely chequered.* At one time he was at court with the merry monarch, at another in a council of assembled ambassadors. In this month he was clothing novices with the Dominican habit at the nunnery at Vilvorde, and in the next consoling his brethren at Bornhem, when the French soldiers besieging Dendermonde had pillaged the convent, and made its hallowed cells the place of carousing. Many cares came upon him in 1668. One of the Religious he had provided for the convent of Tangiers was expelled for having converted two Protestant prisoners condemned to death; and Father Mildmay, the chaplain of the Vilvorde nunnery, fell a victim to the plague while in the discharge of his duties as a priest.

In the following year the same terrible visitation prevented Don Pedro de Velasco, the grand constable of Castile, from proceeding to Brussels as Viceroy of the King of Spain. He remained for a time at Mechlin, and Father Howard was sent by Queen Catharine to congratulate him on his new appointment. His next step was to remove the nuns at Vilvorde, who were exposed to many of the dangers and horrors of war, to the Spellekins-huys, at Brussels, where they were likely to be better protected. Then returning to England, he resumed his functions as Grand Almoner, and during five years was so much occupied at Court as to be unable to revisit Belgium. The King always addressed him as "My Lord," and his charity caused persons to call him by the more honourable title of "the father of the poor." He was the only priest allowed to appear abroad in an ecclesiastical dress, and he wore that of a French Abbé.

Cosmo de Medici, afterwards Grand Duke of Tuscany, visited England in 1669, and Father Howard was often his guest and cicerone. From him we learn that there was some idea at Rome of making him a Vicar Apostolic. "It has been wished there," he wrote, "to consecrate as titular bishop in England some probe and talented native who may superintend the missions in that country, as is done in Holland. For this purpose they cast their eyes on Philip Howard, Grand Almoner to the Queen, having first ascertained that the King was by no

* Fr. Palmer's *Life*, pp. 140-150.

means averse to such a step. But the affairs of the kingdom were unfavourable to the project, in consequence of the deep-rooted prejudices of Parliament against the Catholics. At the King's suggestion, therefore, it was deemed more seasonable and prudent to defer the execution of the design, and wait for a better opportunity. In the meantime the bishops of Ireland perform episcopal functions for the benefit of Catholics, and cross the Channel occasionally to exercise their office in the best manner the times will admit."*

Fearful storms were muttering against Catholics in England. The King's Protestantism was distrusted. The Duke of York's Popery was dreaded. Father Howard was disliked because his influence was considerable and his zeal untiring. He had a hand in the royal Declaration of Toleration for liberty of conscience, which was published in March, 1672,† and almost daily complaints were made of his receiving converts into his Church. He saw clearly the dangers before him, and wrote in December, 1673, to the Maréchal de Bellefond entreating him to spare the convent of Bornhem as the only retreat that he should have when forced to fly again from his native land. The French Ambassador in London was also interested by him in its behalf, and an event soon occurred which showed how correct had been Howard's forebodings.

John Davis and John Greene, the one a chaplain and the other an undergraduate of Magdalen College, Oxford, had been converted by his means to the Roman Church, and the Dean and Chapter of Windsor (whose minor-canon and protégé Davis and Greene were respectively) lost no time in bringing various charges against Howard. He had printed English books of piety with pontifical bulls of indulgences, he had promoted the Declaration of Toleration, and seduced souls from the Reformed Faith. They were resolved to bring the matter before Parliament. They knew their strength. It lay in popular prejudice, and could not be resisted. The King and Queen would be involved in the strife and odium. Howard must fly. He sought and obtained the royal permission, gathered together his church vestments, plate, and money bestowed by the King and Queen for the relief of Catholics abroad in similar distress, and once more found an asylum in Bornhem in September, 1674. Here he resumed his duties as prior, and consoled many of his exiled brethren. The

* *Travels of Cosmo de Medici.* He succeeded his father, Ferdinand II., in 1670, at the age of twenty-seven years.

† March 15th (O. S.), 1671-2.

Oxford converts followed Howard's steps, and Greene became a distinguished member of the persecuted Church.*

On Trinity Sunday, 1675, a traveller was seen near Bornhem, inquiring the way to the English Dominican Convent. When he saw how poor and mean it was, he fancied that he had wandered from the right road, and mistaken the place. He was a messenger sent from Rome, and he came to announce to the prior that on the 27th of May, ten days previously, Pope Clement X. had created him a Cardinal Priest. Dumb with astonishment, Father Howard burst into tears. He turned a deaf ear to the congratulations of the brethren, and could not conceive to whom he owed this promotion. It was in fact his early friend and adviser, Father Hackett, who had become the holy Father's confessor, and recommended Howard to his Holiness as full of devotion, high in rank, and an object of spiteful persecution.

The prior spent several hours in prayer and meditation to ascertain what was the will of God, and then, quitting his solitary cell, repaired to Antwerp to consult the Bishop, who happened to be a Dominican. He knelt for the Bishop's blessing, but his lordship having been privately informed of what had happened, knelt in turn for that of his Eminence. When his advice was asked, he only led Father Howard into his private chapel, prayed a few minutes, and then rising intoned the *Te Deum*. Father Howard rose a Cardinal and Prince of the Holy Roman Church.

The messenger who brought the news of his elevation was the bearer also of a hundred gold crowns from Cosmo de Medici, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and the like sum from Cardinal Altieri. The Cardinal was a patron and protector of the Dominican Order, and his gift was therefore accepted. But Cardinal Howard declined the present from Tuscany: and when one of the brethren expressed a hope that his Catholic Majesty would provide him a good bishopric, he exclaimed: "No, no! I will not bind myself to anybody; for if a man once attaches himself to a prince by receiving a favour, he is always at the prince's beck, even though his conscience may say nay." To this resolution he steadily adhered, and firmly refused many advantages offered him by Spain, France, and Germany.

With the biretta placed on his head, Cardinal Howard settled the affairs of his convents in Belgium, and turned his face toward Rome. Several members of his family accom-

* Fr. Palmer's *Life*, p. 158, note.

panied him, among whom was his uncle, William Viscount Stafford, who, five years after, died on the scaffold on a charge of high treason, an innocent victim of the infamous Titus Oates.* The Cardinal's expenses in this journey, and those of his entry into Rome, were defrayed by the Pope. His rich and noble relatives, however, were not wanting in munificence on the occasion. It was dangerous at that time for English Catholics to correspond, yet we find the Cardinal's brother Henry, Earl of Norwich, writing to him not many days after his promotion was made known. His letter is dated "London, 14-24th June, 1675," and is written with great caution, lest it should fall into the hands of informers. Cardinal Altieri is alluded to as "Ld. Padrone," and the Pope as "chiefe padrone." In the preceding January, a proclamation had been issued fordidding any papist *or reputed papist* from entering the palace at Whitehall or of S. James's, on pain of being committed to the Tower or to a common gaol.† This circumstance will explain a part of the following extract.

"I was out of towne at the arryvall here of the express you sent, and came, the day ere yesterday, to towne. All yesterday and this day I spent in preparing what you desire, and this very night am going to supp with his majesty and the duke, at the Prince of Newburgh's, where, *since I cannot now meet them at Westminster, nor conveniently go to Whitehall*, I will make your compliments, and ask if you desire they should write or not. Next day I will go to the Portugall embassador, and by his advice address to her majesty, and, by Lord Peterborow, to the dutchess."

Lord Norwich then promises to send his brother by the next post a bill for £1,000, payable at Antwerp, and freely "remitts the debt to him from that hower forward," in case of the Cardinal's being unable to repay it with ease. He hopes on his return from Cumberland to furnish his Eminence with a thousand more on the same terms. He has heard, he says, of the generous presents of the great Duke and the Cardinal padrone, but he cannot take upon himself to give advice in the matter whether to accept them or no, but "can answear only for himselfe, that at every turne, he will be a sure carde not to faile his brother in time of the greatest need."

The new Cardinal took the title of *S. Cecilia trans Tyberim*, and was usually called the "Cardinal of Norfolk," or "Cardinal of England." He was visited in Rome by his friend Sir Henry

* Lord Macaulay *Hist.* chap. ii.
† Kennet, iii. 301. Tierney, *History of Arundel*, ii. 530.

Tichborne, whom he had asked to accompany him in his journey to the holy city. He conducted Sir Henry to many distinguished persons and sacred shrines. He took him to "St. John Latteran's, the most ancient Christian Church in Rome," and gave him several "relics of great value of S. Maximus and S. Longinus, with others."*

About the year 1676, Clement X. gave Cardinal Howard the Church of SS. John and Paul with the house adjoining it on Mont Ceilo,† to be used by him as a convent of English Friar-Preachers—thus fulfilling one of the Cardinal's longest cherished desires. He laid out £3,000 in restoring its decayed *campanile*, and watched over the new foundation with ceaseless care. His palace was often visited by three sons of John Dryden, the Laureate. They all of them followed their father when he conformed to the Roman Catholic Church;‡ and one of them, Erasmus Henry, who was born in 1669, became a priest, and undertook a mission in London. In 1710 Sir John Dryden, the fourth Baronet, died, and Erasmus Henry succeeded to the title. But the penal statute of 1699 disabled him from inheriting landed property, and his estates were enjoyed by his nearest Protestant kinsman. Malone "imagines" he was in a state of mental imbecility; but there is ample evidence of the soundness of his mind and the firmness of his faith in the midst of bitter trials.§

During his residence at Rome, Cardinal Howard was as deeply concerned as ever for his Belgian houses; and through his recommendation many members of his family sought their hallowed shades. Though he himself had a palace in Rome, he seems to have used it only for state occasions. He had also apartments in the Vatican and a pension of 10,000 scudi from the Pope. But his ordinary abode was the Dominican convent at S. Sabina, where to the day of his death he shared the humble fare of the friars. He had no wish for needless indulgence when his fellow Catholics in England were exposed to such fierce persecution. Had he been among them, he would no doubt have obtained a crown of martyrdom, for his name was in the list of those who were accused of conspiracy by the perjured Titus Oates, and impeached in both Houses of Parliament.‖ He was appointed (so Oates affirmed on oath) to take possession, as legate, of the forfeited kingdom of England. The Archbishopric of Canterbury was awarded to him, with

* Sir H. Tichborne's *Diurnal of Pilgrimage.*
† Fr. Palmer, p. 172.
‡ A.D. 1686.
§ Fr. Palmer, p. 177.
‖ April 3rd and 7th, 1678.

40,000 crowns a year to maintain his legatine dignity. Martyr after martyr fell in the phrensy of violence produced by such false and senseless charges. Dominican fathers especially were the victims of fanatical fury, and Fr. Palmer has drawn up an interesting catalogue of those of his Order who suffered in the Oates persecution.

Those were gala days for the rack, the knife, and the gibbet.* The whisper of an informer sufficed to blast the peace of families. The law was legal iniquity, more cruel and harassing than open war. Roman Catholics in their homes and lonely chambers were not safe from spies. They were denied the benefits of education, defrauded of their rights as citizens, debarred from liberal professions. An Agnus Dei, a relic, a crucifix, a rosary, might cost any one of them his life. To believe in the Roman supremacy, to harbour a priest, to assist at the holy sacrifice, was to draw down the vengeance of the law and revive the horrors of Decian and Maximinian persecutions. Money alone procured some exemption for the rich, and the secret influence of two successive Catholic Queens, Henrietta Maria and Catharine of Braganza, mitigated in a slight degree the severity of the Elizabethan code. But the marriage of the Duke of York with a Roman Catholic princess, and the conversion of his former wife, the reception of Charles II. into the Church of Rome by Father Huddlestone, and the imprudent, arbitrary, and infatuated way in which James II. exercised his dispensing power, caused the long-cherished animosity of the No-Popery public to burst forth with all the violence of a pent-up volcano.

Cardinal Howard had been appointed Cardinal-protector of England and Scotland on the death of Cardinal Barberini in 1679, and he looked forward with hope and gladness to the day when James II. would mount the throne of his ancestors. But his disappointment was bitter when he found that the indiscretion of James was likely to injure the cause of his Church more than any persecution. He heard with deep regret of Mass being celebrated with pomp and splendour at the royal palace, of a papal nuncio being received in London, and of four Roman Catholics, of whom one was a Jesuit, being called to the privy council. Innocent XI. shared the alarm felt by Cardinal Howard. He looked coldly on the English Ambassador at Rome, and sought rather to strengthen the spiritual condition of his flock in England, than to obtain for

* See *Tryals of the Roman Priests at the Old Bailey*, 1679. Macaulay's *History*, chap. ii.

ı the less solid advantage of political power. He there-
consecrated Howard's friend and secretary, John Leyburn,
'icar Apostolic in England, so that the faithful might not
ıdebted to the chance visits of Irish Bishops for episcopal
strations. The King lodged him in Whitehall, and be-
'ed on him a pension of £1,000 a year. Ferdinand,
nt of Adda, accompanied him as Nuncio. They were
ged by his Holiness to inculcate moderation; and if
es had listened to them instead of to Barillon and such
double-dealers, he might have ruled in unison with his
iament, and have promoted the liberties of his people.
Leyburn was "the most cautious, dexterous, and taciturn
ıen."* He boldly remonstrated with the King on the
ence offered to the Fellows of Magdalen College, but his
ce had little weight. Adda was a man "of mild temper
courtly manners," and he did not at first assume any
ial character. The correspondence between him and the
e on the affairs of England, a copy of which is preserved
ıe British Museum,† abundantly proves how wise were the
's of the Papal Court and how insane those of the English
g.

Bishop Burnet visited Rome in 1685, and had much
rcourse with Cardinal Howard. Again and again the
ıan prelate assured the Anglican divine of the displeasure
disappointment with which King James's conduct was
'ed at Rome. He saw plainly, he said, that violent courses
were acceptable, and that the counsels of the Vatican
ld be little heeded. Burnet was highly pleased with the
linal, and mentions several particulars in proof of "the
temper of that good-natured man."‡

The downfall of James II. is a thrice-told tale. He not
forfeited his crown, but in effect disinherited his son—
son in whose birth the people of Rome rejoiced, and knew
then with how many misgivings Cardinal Howard feasted
n on an ox roasted whole and stuffed with lambs, fowls,
all kinds of dainties. With James's flight, the ecclesiastical
ty he had built up fell to pieces like a house of cards. No
-provincial of the Jesuits sat, as he had intended, in the
of York. The Vicars-Apostolic were thrown into prison.
burn was lodged in the Tower, Giffard and Ellis in New-
. The last of these when liberated joined the King at
Germain, and subsequently formed a strict friendship with
linal Howard in Rome.

Lord Macaulay, *Hist.* chap. vi. 1685. † Additional MSS., No. 15,895.
History of his own Times.

Little now remains to be narrated respecting him. He assisted at the election of three Popes in the conclaves held in 1676, 1689, and 1691, in which Innocent XI., Alexander VIII., and Innocent XII. were raised respectively to the Papal dignity. He discharged his duties invariably in a simple, earnest, and upright way, and throughout life he kept steadily in view his great object, the restoration of the Dominican Order in England. He accepted no dignity but in hope of forwarding this cherished design, and he thus worthily adorned "S. Dominic's white wool, which no blemish can impair, no stain can dim."* It was clearly the work which Providence had assigned him in times of peculiar difficulty, when religion was too often only a badge of party and a watchword of strife. He lived just long enough to see a Dominican province reconstituted in his native land, and then, after a season of declining health, he fell asleep in the summer of 1694. His memory is treasured up by his family as a most precious heritage, for though he figures little in the page of history, his life was really and in the best sense heroic.

He desired in his will to be buried with as few ceremonies as possible, whether he should die in Rome or elsewhere. All the provisions of his last testament proved the justice and piety of his feelings. His relations, his friends, the Church, and above all his brother Dominicans, had reason to applaud his equity. His death took place on the 17th of June, when he was in the 64th year of his age, and the 48th of his religious profession. His loss was deplored by all who knew him, and especially by all the Religious of Bornhem, who revered him as their Father, Founder, and Friend. His likeness may be seen in "Mudie's Medals," and in six different castles and portrait galleries. At Norfolk House there is a curious print by Vesterhout, 1688, in which the "Cardinal Ovard de Norfolcia" is dealing out to the Roman people the roasted ox, with lambs and fowls peeping through the animal's sides.

* Dr. Newman. "The Second Spring." *Sermons*, 1858, p. 238.

Art. XIV.—RATIONALE OF THE SERVICES OF THE HOLY EASTERN CHURCH.

It will be my endeavour, in the course of this paper, to present the English reader with a clear and connected account of the probable origin, intention, and meaning of the public Services of the Eastern Orthodox Church. For information respecting the formulæ themselves, as actually existing in the service-books, many learned and useful works are available, but I am not aware of any, at least in the English language, in which the rationale of them is explained; or which give a general and connected notion of the manner in which the Books themselves are used. A practical acquaintance with the numerous volumes containing the ritual, is no doubt better calculated to enable one to succeed in such an endeavour than any amount of erudition, so much being left to unwritten custom; for the freedom, practically allowed in their use, is so great, that it is simply impossible to gain an accurate knowledge of the services, as performed in the churches, from any books.

The fact is, that the Orthodox Church of the East possesses neither Act of Uniformity, nor Congregation of Rites. The only laws of universal obligation, bearing upon the celebration of Divine Service, consist in a comparatively few Canons of Councils and Fathers, for the most part conceived in general terms; and with this exception, all is regulated by a silent, but effectual tradition; yet this alone has been sufficient to preserve, in all its integrity, a ceremonial unequalled for grandeur, sublimity, and impressiveness; which, in spite of the sneers of ignorant and unbelieving pleasure-seekers, is peculiarly spiritual in its effect; and which is, more than probably, the most ancient form of worship in existence. This last is an attribute well worthy of remark, especially when we consider the vicissitudes to which the Church herself has been subjected; and the length, and apparent intricacy of the services. It might naturally be supposed, that a ritual of such a character, depending solely upon the voluntary conformity of so extensive and wide-spead a community, could not possibly possess the character of permanence; but the reality of the fact affords most valuable testimony, at the same time to the efficiency of tradition, when carefully guarded, as a preservative of the ordinances and doctrines of religion; and to the firm adherence maintained by the Orthodox Church to

that system of faith and worship which she received at the beginning. Hence it is, that, from China to Marseilles; from Lapland to the Equator; embracing a thousand languages, and nations, and tongues; she binds them together in the golden link of the same Faith: "offering the Tremendous Sacrifice in a hundred Liturgies, but offering it to the same God, and with the same rites: she is now, as she was from the beginning, multiplex in her arrangements, simple in her faith, difficult of comprehension to strangers, easily intelligible to her sons." And in this holy Union, may we not include the Armenian community, which, although now separated by a misunderstanding, has retained the same faith and the same form of worship?

For the more intelligible and distinct explanation of a ceremonial so venerable, sublime, and full of interest, I shall treat the subject in the following order: 1. I shall enumerate and describe the different classes of composition, which form the component parts of the different services. 2. I shall then indicate the most probable origin of each service separately; and 3. Taking each service in its turn, I shall describe its arrangement and ceremonial: but in doing so shall confine myself for the most part to those services which are more especially public, namely, the Liturgy, and the Morning and Evening Services: and, since the Liturgy has recently met with several able commentators and exponents, in my remarks upon it, I shall be guided by what I suppose to be less generally known, rather than by the actual importance of the service itself, which, of course, outweighs that of all the others put together.

Supposing we were to enter an assembly of Christians, met together for Divine Worship, in the age immediately succeeding that of the Apostles; what would be the appearance presented by it? The records of the primitive Church leave us in no uncertainty on the point: we should find the meeting presided over by the Bishop, or one of the Presbyters especially deputed by him; the rest of the Priests would surround him; the deacons would be in attendance in an inferior station; and the faithful would "stand around" in front of them. Now, this simple arrangement itself was not devoid of a mystic significance in the eyes of the Church; we have only to turn to the Epistles of S. Ignatius Theophorus, to ascertain what it was: "Your Bishop," he says, "presides in the place of God, and your presbyters in the place of the assembly of the Apostles, along with your deacons." And again, in his Epistle to the Trallians: "Let all men reverence

the deacons as the appointment of Jesus Christ, and the Bishops as Jesus Christ, Who is the Son of the Father, and the Presbyters as the Sanhedrim of God, and assembly of the Apostles: without these is there no Church." Bearing in mind this symbolism, we can easily understand how there would necessarily be found, in the first place, the Prayer, emphatically so called, bidden by the deacons, as representing the people, who testify their assent by frequent responses and acclamations: secondly, the solemn Sacramental orisons and benedictions pronounced by the Bishop, in the person of Christ, and addressed either to God or to the people, but in both cases in the name and person of Christ. In the third place we shall find the Psalms and other hymns of praise joined in by the whole Church, choir answering choir, after the pattern of the heavenly hosts; and lastly, and in the fourth place, the Scriptures, Epistles, Gospels, Acts of Martyrs, and other lessons, will be required for the edification of the assembly. Here we have the origin of all the different classes of composition found, in our own day, in the Public Services of the Orthodox Church.

Of the prayers bidden by the deacon, numerous examples have been preserved, several of which may be seen in Bingham; of these, six in special have been retained by the Orthodox Church; and these form a most important and prominent part of every public service. It should be observed, that these alone are properly and technically called prayers: *preces;* the continuous compositions, which currently go by that name, are, for the most part, private compositions, containing some definite petition, more or less amplified. On the other hand these prayers, *preces*, are the composition of the Church herself. It will be interesting to point out that, while, in point of form, the Anglican Litany most resembles these prayers, their true representatives in the Prayer Book, by right of legitimate descent, are the Collects for Good Friday, and hence, in a lesser degree, all the Collects; these are the only remains of the ancient Mass-litany of the West.

I shall now give a translation of the six principal forms, in which the Eastern Church has retained this primitive kind of prayer; and by doing so, shall afterwards be enabled to proceed with my description of the services with less need for reiteration.

I. The Irenica.

The Deacon. In peace let us pray of the Lord.

The Choir. Kyrie eleison. *And so at the end of each petition.*

For the peace from above, and the salvation of our souls, let us pray of the Lord.

For the peace of the whole world, the welfare of the Holy Churches of God, and the union of them all, let . . . .

For this holy house, and them that with faith, reverence, and fear of God, enter into it, let . . . .

For our Archbishop, (*by name*), the reverend Presbytery, the Diaconate in Christ, all the clergy and the people, let . . . .

For our most religious kings, in the keeping of God, all their court, and their army, let . . . .

That He would fight with them, and put down every enemy and foe under their feet, let . . . .

For this holy abode, (*or this city,*) every city, county, and the faithful dwelling in them, let . . . .

For favourable weather, plenty of the fruits of the earth, and peaceful times, let . . . .

For them that travel by land, or by water, sick persons, labourers, and prisoners, and their salvation, let . . . .

That He would deliver us from all trouble, wrath, peril, and want, let . . . .

Help, save, pity, and guard us, O God, by Thy grace.

Commemorating our most holy, pure, most blessed, glorious Lady, the Mother of God, and ever-virgin Mary; with all the Saints, let us commend ourselves, and each other, and our whole life, to Christ our God.

The Choir. To Thee, O Lord.

Then follows the Doxology, or Exclamation, chanted by the Bishop or Priest, as follows:—

For to Thee is due all glory, honour, and worship; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; now, and ever, and to the ages of ages.

The Choir. Amen.

This prayer is commonly used at the earlier part of every public service; it is also used at the administration of the Sacraments, special petitions being inserted, appropriate to the occasion; thus it forms the "prayer" which accompanies the laying on of hands in ordination. It will be noticed, that the last petition, *Help, save,* &c., is not followed by any response; it is so printed in the Greek editions; in the Russian it, like the rest, is followed by *Kyrie eleison*, but, judging from its connection with the "long ektene," to be presently given, if I might express an opinion, I should say that the proper response to it is: "Vouchsafe, O Lord."

II. The Short Ektene.

The Deacon. Again and again in peace, let us pray of the Lord.

The Choir. Kyrie eleison.

Help, save, &c., *as in the Irenica.*

Commemorating, &c., *as the same.*

Then follows a proper Doxology, or Exclamation, which the Ektene is intended to introduce.

The origin of this repetition of part of the Irenica, with a brief introduction, is probably to be found in the 17th Canon of the Council of Laodicea: "Let not the Psalms be joined together, in the assemblies of the Church, but a lesson be read after every Psalm." Hence this prayer was introduced to break the monotony; and, while the Deacon recites the Ektene, the Priest, in a low tone, says an orison, concluding with a doxology in a louder tone, which thus serves as a termination to the Ektene, as well as to the orison. The same thing is done during the recitation of the Irenica.

III. The Repeated Ektene.

The Deacon. Let us all say, with our whole heart, and our whole mind, let us say.

The Choir. Kyrie eleison. *Three times, and so at the end of each petition.*

Lord Almighty, the God of our fathers, we pray Thee, hear, and have mercy.

Have mercy upon us, O Lord, after Thy great mercy, we pray Thee, hear, and have mercy.

Again we pray for our most religious Sovereign (*by name*), that he may obtain power, victory, long life, peace, health, safety; and that the Lord our God would aid and further him in everything, and put down every enemy and foe underhis feet.

Again we pray for pious and orthodox Christians.

Again we pray for (*the Patriarch, Metropolitan, Archbishop, or Synod, according to the Autokephalous ruler of the Church,*) our Bishop (*by name*), and for all our brethren in Christ.

Again we pray for our brethren, the Priests, (*and other members of the clergy of the particular church, whether regulars or seculars,*) and all the brotherhood in Christ.

Again we pray for the blessed and ever memorable orthodox Patriarchs, the pious Emperors and Empresses, the founders of this holy abode, for all our orthodox fathers and

brethren, departed before us, who rest here, and the orthodox everywhere.

Again we pray for those who bring forth fruit, and do good, in this holy and venerable temple; for them that serve, that sing, and for the people that stand around, awaiting from Thee Thy great and rich mercy.

The Priest. For Thou art the good God, and the Lover of men, and to Thee we ascribe the glory, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; now, and ever, and to the ages of ages. *The Choir.* Amen.

The proper place of this prayer is after the lessons of the Morning Service, and of the Litany, also of the Evening Service, when there are any lessons belonging to it.

IV. The Long Ektene.

The Deacon. Let us fulful our prayer to the Lord. *The Choir.* Kyrie eleison.

Help, save, pity, and guard us, O God, by Thy grace. *The Choir.* Vouchsafe, O Lord.

That the whole day may be perfect, holy, peaceful, and sinless, let us beseech from the Lord. *The Choir.* Vouchsafe, O Lord (*and so at the end of each petition*).

An angel of peace, faithful guide, guardian of our souls and bodies, let us beseech from the Lord.

Pardon and forgiveness of our sins and transgressions, let . . . .

Things good and profitable for our souls, and peace for the world, let . . . .

That the remainder of our lives may be spent in peace and penitence, let . . . .

Christian ends of our lives, painless, shameless, peaceful; and a good answer at the fearful tribunal of Christ.

Commemorating, &c., *as in the Irenica.*

V. The Lite or Litany.

The Deacon. O God, save Thy people, and bless Thine inheritance: look upon Thy world in mercy and compassion: exalt the horns of orthodox Christians, and send down upon us the fulness of Thy mercy: at the prayers of our most pure Lady, the Mother of God, and ever-virgin Mary: the power of the precious and life-giving Cross: the patronage of the precious, heavenly, bodiless Powers: of the glorious Prophet, Forerunner, and Baptist, John: the holy, glorious, and all-famous Apostles: our Fathers among Saints, great High-Priests, and Œcumenical Doctors, Basil the Great, Gregory

the Divine, and John Chrysostom: our Father among Saints, Nicholas, Archbishop of Myra, in Lycia, the Wonderworker: of the holy, glorious, and all-conquering Martyrs: of our Religious and inspired Fathers: of the holy and righteous ancestors of God, Joachim and Anna: of Saint (*the patron of the Church*), and of all Thy Saints: we entreat Thee, most merciful Lord, hear us sinners, praying to Thee, and have mercy upon us. *The First Choir.* Kyrie eleison (*thrice*).

Again we pray for our most religious kings, in the keeping of God (*as in the repeated Ektene*). *The Second Choir.* Kyrie eleison (*thrice*).

Again we pray for our Archbishop (*or Bishop, by name, as the case may be*), and all our brethren in Christ: and for every Christian soul in trouble and distress, needing the mercy and help of God: for the protection of this holy city, and them that dwell in it: for the peace and prosperity of the whole world: the stability of the holy Churches of God: the salvation and assistance of our fathers and brethren that labour and minister with diligence and fear of God: for them that are forsaken, or in exile: for the health of those who are lying in sickness: release, blessed memory, and forgiveness of sins, of all our fathers and brethren, piously departed, that lie here, and the orthodox everywhere: for the deliverance of captives: and for all our brethren in the ministry: and for all that minister, or have ministered, in this holy Church, let us say . . . .

The Choir. Kyrie eleison (*thrice*).

Again we pray that this city, and this holy temple, and all cities and countries, may be preserved from famine, pestilence, earthquakes, deluge, fire, sword, from the invasion of foreign enemies, and from civil war: and that our gracious and loving God, through His mercy, good pleasure, and compassion, may be pleased to turn away from us all wrath that is moved against us, and deliver us from His righteous threatening that hangeth over us, and to have mercy upon us.

The Choir. Kyrie eleison (*forty times*).

Again we pray that the Lord our God would hear the voice of the prayer of us sinners, and have mercy upon us.

The Choir. Kyrie eleison (*thrice*).

The Priest.

Hear us, O God our Saviour, the hope of all the ends of the earth, and of them on the broad sea, and be merciful, be merciful, O Lord, to our sins, and have pity upon us, for Thou

art the merciful God, the lover of mankind, and to Thee we ascribe the glory, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, now and ever, and to the ages of ages. *The Choir.* Amen.

This prayer is said at the end of Evening Service on certain festivals, after the *Idiomela;* the choir is divided into two, and respond alternately; in the Slavonic, the *Kyrie eleison,* or *Ghospodi pomilui,* is said forty, thirty, and fifty times to the three first petitions.

VI. The Intercessory Prayer.

Let us pray for the peace of the world.

Answer. Kyrie eleison.

For pious and orthodox Christians.

For prosperity and protection of the Christian army.

For our archbishop, and all our brethren in Christ.

For our departed fathers and brethren.

For them that serve, and have served us.

For them that hate, and that love us.

For them that have charged us, though unworthy, to pray for them.

For deliverance of captives.

For them sailing well on the seas.

For them lying in sickness.

Let us pray also for plenty of the fruits of the earth.

And for our departed fathers and brethren that lie here, and the orthodox everywhere.

Let us say also for ourselves

Kyrie eleison (*thrice*).

This prayer is placed at the end of Great Compline, and is chiefly intended for the use of monks; it is followed by the following, "to be said in their cells":—

Them that hate, and that injure us, do Thou pardon, O Lord. Do good to our benefactors. Grant to our brethren and relations their requests unto salvation and eternal life. Look upon them in sickness, and give them health. Direct those at sea. Travel with them that travel. Fight with the King. Grant forgiveness of sins to them that serve, and pity us. Have mercy, according to Thy great mercy, upon them that have charged us, though unworthy, to pray for them. Be mindful, O Lord, of our departed fathers and brethren, and give them rest, where the light of Thy countenance shineth. Be mindful, O Lord, of our captive brethren, and deliver them from all distress. Be mindful, O Lord, of them that bear fruit, and do good, in Thy holy Churches, and give

them their requests unto salvation and eternal life. Be mindful, O Lord, of us, Thy humble, and sinful, and unworthy servants, and guide us in the path of Thy commandments, at the prayers of Thy most blessed Mother, our Lady the Mother of God, and ever-virgin Mary, and all Thy saints: for blessed art Thou to the ages of ages. Amen.

We next come to the Orisons, *Euchai, Orationes;* these may be subdivided into three classes: 1. Sacramental; 2. Benedictory; and 3. Occasional. Of these, the first class are necessarily the most ancient, and for the most part may be said to belong to the Church herself; though they have been edited, or arranged, by particular Bishops. Of these Sacramental prayers the most ancient and august is, of course, the great Eucharistic Prayer, founded on the very words, and at the express command of our Lord Himself. The general tenor of this Prayer is alike in all ancient Liturgies, after rehearsing the praises of God for creation, providence, and salvation, it quotes the words of our Lord on instituting the Eucharist, by way of *narrative;* and then, encouraged by His command, the prayer goes on to entreat that the consecration of the bread and wine may be effected, in the obedience of His Church to His command, and by virtue of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the offered gifts. The Benedictory and occasional Orisons, generally, go by the name of their authors; some of them are of Scripture origin, thus the Prayer of Manasses forms part of the Great Compline, and a short prayer, attributed to S. Ephrem Syrus, commencing "O Lord, and Master of my life," is evidently founded on the first verses of the twenty-third chapter of Ecclesiasticus.

To the class of Benedictory Prayers may be referred the "Prayers of Inclination" in the Morning and Evening Services, and in the Liturgy; they are of great antiquity, and were repeated by the Bishop, stretching out his hands towards heaven, over the people, who meanwhile were profoundly inclined; the following is the prayer for the Morning:—

Deacon. Let us bow our heads to the Lord.

The Choir. To Thee, O Lord.

Priest. Holy Lord, that dwellest on high, and beholdest the lowly, and with Thine all-seeing eye lookest upon all creation; to Thee have we bowed the neck of our soul and body: and we pray Thee, Holy of holies, stretch forth Thine unseen hand, from Thy holy dwelling place, and bless us all; and, if we have offended in anything, voluntarily or involun-

tarily, do Thou, as the good God and lover of men, pardon us, giving us the good things of this world, and of that which is to come. For, &c.

The forms of praise used in the Eastern Church are of such varied kinds, that the study of them, as hitherto treated, is a matter of some difficulty, inasmuch as it has been conducted in a manner entirely devoid of system: I shall therefore endeavour to reduce them to order, and that according to a system which is founded upon their real origin. The key of the whole arrangement is the antiphonal division of the Choir in the primitive Church. Starting with the Psalms, there were introduced Antiphona, Prokimena, Odes, Kanons, Stichera, and all the numerous varieties of composition which give to the Service Books of the Eastern Church such an appearance of complexity.

The use of the Psalms was, of course, contemporaneous with the very foundation of the Church; the class of compositions next in antiquity is that called hymns; they are, for the most part, very short, and are not numerous. We shall soon see that one of these, the "Greater Doxology," or "*Gloria in excelsis*," is found appended to the Psalter, in the Codex Alexandrinus; it is there entitled "Morning Hymn," and, though exceptionally long, is an excellent example of the style of simple fervour which characterizes this class of composition. Corresponding with it, we have the "Evening Hymn;" this is, in fact, a thanksgiving for artificial light, to be used in the evening, and is as follows:—

Joyful Light of the holy glory of the Father, Immortal, Heavenly, Holy, Blessed, O Jesu Christ; coming to the setting of the sun, beholding evening light, we hymn God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. It is meet, at all times, to hymn Thee with praising voices, O Son of God, giver of life: wherefore the world glorifieth Thee.

Another of these hymns, of equal antiquity, is the Trisagion Hymn; this, however, is sung antiphonally, as follows:—

First Choir:

Holy God, Holy Mighty,* Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us.

Second Choir.

Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us.

* The addition of the conjunction in this hymn has been strictly forbidden by the Church, and was required to be removed upon the mission of Theorian for the re-union of the Armenians.

First Choir:

Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us.

Second Choir:

Glory to Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost, both now and ever, and to the ages of ages. Amen. Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us.

The First Choir, with augmented tone:

Dynamis. Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us.

This is the first great hymn, used in the divine Liturgy: the Triumphal Hymn, also used therein, is, however, more ancient still: it is as follows:—

Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord Sabaoth:
Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory;
Hosanna in the highest:
Blessed is he that cometh in the Name of the Lord:
Hosanna in the highest.

In speaking of the Psalmody of the Eastern Orthodox Church, it is highly instructive to observe what is included in the Psalter, which forms part of the Alexandrian Codex; for we shall thereby be enabled to learn the great antiquity of the arrangements now followed in her use of the Psalter, and also find what is, in fact, the groundwork of nearly the entire system of her hymns. This Psalter, then, in addition to the 150 Psalms, contains fourteen Canticles, there called *Odes*, in the following order, and under the following titles:—

(1) Hymn I. Ode of Moses in Exodus. [ch. xv.]
(2) Hymn II. Ode of Moses in Deuteronomy. [ch. xxxii.]
(3) Hymn III. Prayer of Anna, mother of Samuel. [1 Kings (1 Sam.) ii. 1.]
(5) Hymn IV. Prayer of Esaias. [ch. xxvi. 9.]
(6) Hymn V. Prayer of Jona. [ch. ii. 2.]
(4) Hymn VI. Prayer of Ambakum. [Habbakuk iii. 1.]
Hymn VII. Prayer of Ezekias. [Isaiah xxxviii. 10.]
Hymn VIII. Prayer of Manasses.
(7) Hymn IX. Prayer of Azarias. [Dan. iii. 26, LXX.]
(8) Hymn X. Hymn of our Fathers. [Dan. vi. 52.]
(9) Hymn XI. Prayer of Mary Mother of God. [Luke i. 46.]
Hymn XII. Prayer of Symeon. [Luke ii. 29.]
(9) Hymn XIII. Prayer of Zacharias. [Luke i. 68.]
Hymn XIV. Morning Hymn. [Gloria in excelsis.]"

These Hymns being thus arranged in this most ancient Scripture Codex, we may be assured that their use in the Church dated from the very earliest period; we now find them, with a slight difference in their arrangement, still used in the services of the Eastern Church. The order in which they are now recited, I have indicated by the Arabic numerals, prefixed to them; the 11th and 13th are joined together, and the 12th set apart for the Evening Service; whilst the others are said in the morning, as is also the 14th. The seventh is not said at all. The eighth is used as a prayer.

There is no need for me to dwell upon the antiquity of the alternate chanting of Psalms in the Christian Church; what I have here to show is, how the various kinds of stichoi and troparia originated in the practice. And first, it will readily be seen how, when it was wished to introduce a certain degree of variety, as well as special application, into any Psalm, one choir might continue the chanting of the Psalm whilst the other would chant, between each two verses, a succession of other verses relating to the subject of the day. Let this be done, and we at once have an Antiphon; take, for example, the second Antiphonon for the Liturgy at Pentecost, formed on the 19th Psalm (LXX.)

1*st Choir:* The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble: the Name of the God of Jacob defend thee.

2*nd Choir:* Save us, O Good Paraclete, who chant to Thee, Alleluia!

1*st Choir:* Send thee help from the sanctuary: and defend thee out of Sion.

2*nd Choir:* Save us, O Good Paraclete, who chant to Thee, Alleluia.

1*st Choir:* May He be mindful of all thy sacrifices: and may thine holocaust be made fat.

2*nd Choir:* Save us, O Good Paraclete, who chant to Thee, Alleluia.

1*st Choir:* Glory to Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost;

2*nd Choir:* Save us, O Good Paraclete, who chant to Thee, Alleluia.

1*st Choir:* Both now, and ever, and to the ages of ages. Amen.

2*nd Choir:* Save us, O Good Paraclete, who chant to Thee, Alleluia.

Here we have a full Antiphonon, properly so called, and, of course, each division consists of a single verse or stichos; then, founded upon this model, we have the *Prokimenon;*

an Antiphon, that is of only two or four verses. *Anavathmoi;* by which are meant certain Antiphona, always three in number, formed upon the first verses of certain of the *Anavathmoi,* or *Gradual* Psalms. Various kinds of *Stichera,* such as those appended to the concluding verses of the 140th, 141st, and 116th Psalms, which, recited together, form what I shall, in explaining the Evening Service, call its *Third Stage;* those called the *Stichera of the Stichos* modelled upon the 122nd Psalm, and which form part of what I shall call the *Fourth Stage* of the Evening Service.

Evlogetaria, are Stichera, alternating with the 12th verse of the 118th Psalm, "Blessed art Thou, O Lord: teach me Thy justifications." They are said during the *second stage* of the Morning Service; on Saturdays they refer to the burial, and on Sundays to the Resurrection of our Lord.

Exactly the same process, to which we have here seen the Psalms subjected, is applied to the Scripture Odes, of which I have spoken; in course of time new odes were composed, and interspersed with the nine original ones, but not throughout each ode; for the number of supplementary, or ecclesiastical odes, used in any one service, is always limited, and only alternated with the concluding eight, six, four, or two verses, according to the number prescribed by the rubric. This being the case, supposing each Scripture ode were to be supplemented with a series of ecclesiastical odes, the necessity would arise for nine such odes to be composed, suitable to each occasion; but, inasmuch as the Second Ode, which is of a penitential character, was only recited in Lent; in practice, only eight odes are required. Incidentally, I would suggest whether we may not here see the origin of the eight Ecclesiastical Tones, or modes, of the plain-song of the Church? These eight odes form what is called a *Canon,* and each verse is called a *Troparion.* Again: just as *Anavathmoi, Stichera,* and *Stichera of the Stichos,* are modifications or fragments of Antiphona, so *Kathismata, evlogetaria,* and *Megalynaria,* are modifications or fragments of Canons. So we have:—

1. Psalms.
2. Antiphona,
3. Prokimena,
4. Anavathmoi,
5. Stichera,
6. Apostichoi.

} all consisting of Stichoi or verses.

7. Canons.

8. Kathismata,
9. Evlogetaria, } all consisting of Troparia.
10. Megalynaria,

Subsidiary to all these terms, we have others, which are easily explained, when once the system is understood. The Troparia which form a Canon, are often arranged *acrostically*, their initial letters forming generally a sentence. A *theotokion* is a troparion, or stichos, especially relating to the Mother of God; a *staurotheotokion*, one relating to the Cross as well. A *prosomoion* is a stichos which fixes the metre of the following ones. A *Hirmos* is a troparion which fixes the metre of the following ones. An *Idiomelon* is a stichos which has its own melody.

Exaposteilaria are a class of Stichera, and not Troparia, as Dr. Neale supposes, the invention of Constantine, son of Leo the Philosopher. I have no doubt that they are so called from so frequently referring to the mission of the Apostles after the Resurrection of Christ.

A *Hypakoe* is a sort of sticheron, occurring in the Second Stage of the Morning Service; the origin of the name is not properly known.

The *Contakion* is a troparion occurring just before the Oikos, between the sixth and seventh Odes of a Canon, and therefore, normally in the Third Stage of the Morning Service. The legend, as given in the Synaxarion for October 1, when the Church celebrates the commemoration of S. Romanus, is as follows:—That the Mother of God appeared to him, and gave him a piece of a parchment roll, which she commanded him to eat. He obeyed, and found himself endowed with the power of making Contakia. The word is derived from κοντὸς, the roller round which the parchment is wound. The *Oikos*, which always follows the Contakion, is the same word as the Latin *stanza*, signifying a house; it differs little from other troparia save in being longer, and frequently ending with a series of invocations, which are sometimes of considerable beauty.

A *kathisma* signifies a troparion, interpolated between the proper troparia of a Canon, to afford the worshippers an opportunity for sitting, since the usual posture, during the services, is, everywhere, standing.

A *Katabasia*, is a sticheron, in which the two Choirs unite in the midst of the Church, and sing together.

The *Koinonikon*, is a short Antiphon to be sung in the Liturgy, at the time of Communion.

Megalynaria, are troparia, generally in a series, framed on the model (or supposed to be so) of the *Magnificat.*

Psalms 3, 37, 62, 87, 102, and 142, are called *Hexapsalmos;* or, by the Orthodox in England, the *Beautiful Psalms:* they from the basis of the First Stage of Morning Service; the 118th Psalm is called the *Amómos*, or "Blameless;" the *Gradual Psalms* are also distinguished; as are also the 135th or *Polyeleos*, the 103rd or *Præmiac*, which forms the First Stage of Evening Service, and the 148th, 149th, and 150th, which are called *the Praises;* and form an important part of what I shall call the Fourth stage of the Morning Service.

It only remains for me to mention the Lessons, read during the Services. The Lessons from Scripture consist of the Prophecies, read at Evening Service on certain occasions, and the Epistles and Gospels read during the Liturgy. There are also the Synaxaria, or Lives of the Saints, and accounts of the occasion of the Festival, read during the Morning Service, after the Sixth Ode of the Canon; and Sermons, which, in some cases, are collected in volumes, for the use of all the Churches in each particular Province.

S. ORTHODOXUS.

THE [illegible]

[illegible] 1868.

[illegible]

[illegible] By Goldwin [illegible] Parker. 1868.

[illegible] London: Trübner, [illegible]

[illegible] Rt. Hon. [illegible] Stephens, M.P. [illegible] 1868.

[illegible] By Archbishop [illegible] Longmans. 1868.

[illegible] Rev. J. M. Neale, [illegible] 1868.

[illegible] Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, [illegible] Hayes. 1868.

[illegible] Edited by Rev. Orby Shipley. [illegible] Longmans. 1868.

[illegible] Hayes. 1867.

[illegible] By Herbert [illegible] Longmans. 1868.

[illegible]

[illegible] Church of England [illegible] an extremely [illegible] simply in knowing [illegible] and afterwards in over-[illegible] the [illegible] One after the [illegible] perplexing trials meet us. [illegible] with a unanimity that appears [illegible] as we look back on the shifting course of events, [illegible] on the one hand, we were [illegible] of Clarendon on the other. So [illegible] only in the restoration of [illegible] and practice since Mr. Keble's celebrated Assize [illegible] preached at Oxford in July, 1833, but so many [illegible] have been placed in the way of continuing the [illegible] preparation for Corporate Reunion, that we cannot for [illegible] doubt either of the favour of Almighty God or of [illegible] intercession of the Blessed Mother of our Lord [illegible] Saints on behalf of our ancient Church. [illegible] the faithful of the present stirring days, too,

as done its work: only we must still continue to labour as well as to pray, if we would see the vision of S. Edward the Confessor a blessed reality, and Corporate Re-union eventually secured.

The present crisis being a complication of crises, we take upon ourselves to express an opinion with regard to several important subjects which, no doubt, at the present fill the mind and occupy the attention of many of our readers. And to make clear what we have to say, the various subjects in question are set forth under seven heads. 1. The action of Mr. Gladstone and the Liberals as regards the Irish Establishment. 2. The attitude of Roman Catholics regarding the Irish question. 3. The attitude of Protestant Dissenters concerning the same. 4. The question of secession to Rome. 5. The Natal Scandal. 6. The Ritualistic cases. 7. The prosecution of the Vicar of Froome.

1, 2, 3.—With reference to the Irish Established Church, notorious difficulties prevent many from rendering its defenders any support. For ourselves we may at once allow that its ingrained Protestantism renders it positively repulsive. There is nothing either great, noble, or attractive in its mission, work, or present position. The Bishop of London has three times as many members of the Church of England under his jurisdiction as there are in the whole of Ireland, and consequently the injustice of such a state of things as that which provides two archbishops and ten bishops for so small a community cannot but be patent. Moreover, Dr. Maziere Brady's notorious historical facts can hardly be said to have been set aside by the general abuse with which they have been received, or by the particular pamphlets which have been issued in answer to them. For the Irish Establishment is mainly indebted for its tone to Oliver Cromwell and Dutch William; persons not very highly considered by Conservative Catholics. On the other hand, we are far from denying that in times past eminent theologians and learned prelates have adorned that establishment. Usher and Bramhall in previous centuries, Mant and Todd in the present, are not likely to be soon forgotten as able defenders of the Anglican position on a basis which is at once both sound and Catholic.

But the rapid march of events and the present needs of the Liberal party, having tended to bring out into strong relief the conflicting issues which have been raised, there can be little doubt that some most material alterations in the relations of the Irish Establishment to the State will speedily be made. Though it may be difficult to allow the sincerity of

a statesman whose party, having been almost continually in power for the last twenty-five years, made no changes when they *were* in power, but now furbish up a cry for the sake, in the first instance, of turning a "rabble" into a powerful political organization; yet there can be little doubt that their political opponents, the Tories, fully admit the need for prompt reform and sufficient action. The *Weekly Register*, a not very refined organ of the Anglo-Roman Whigs, thus writes with regard to a compromise which it has been whispered about is not unlikely to be proposed by the personal representative of a distinguished Liberal peer:—

"It is intended then, if rumour be true, to expedite the report of what is amusingly called Earl Russell's Commission, and in that report to recommend, as a counter move to Mr. Gladstone's resolutions, a new arrangement of the Established Church in Ireland, which will involve the extinction as lives drop of one archbishop and five bishops, and of sundry deaneries, archdeaconries, prebends, canonries, rectories, and other useless incumbencies. Are the authors, or advisers, or promoters of this scheme so silly as to imagine that it can save the condemned Establishment, or even procure a respite of its doom? If they be, Dame Partington was a model of wisdom compared with them. Can't they perceive that it is not the number of Anglican bishops, deans, &c., in Ireland, or the mode in which they divide the ecclesiastical revenues among them, that causes the irritation which Mr. Gladstone proposes so remove? For all the Irish Catholics, that is, the Irish people, care, the Irish Anglicans may have ten times as many archbishops, bishops, deans, chapters, rectors, &c., as they have now, or had when Lord Derby laid violent hands upon their episcopacy four-and-thirty years ago, provided they support them out of their own private means, as the Catholics support their prelates and priests, and provided the disestablishment of the Anglican Church puts an end to Protestant ascendancy in a Catholic country. That offensive and wholly unwarrantable ascendancy is the abuse, the grievance, the evil which, at the invitation of Mr. Gladstone, the House of Commons, by an overwhelming majority, has resolved to remove without delay, and no such contemptible scheme as that we have alluded to can be listened to for a moment as an admissible substitute for Mr. Gladstone's wise, just, and politic proposition."—*Weekly Register*, April 18, 1868.

Disestablishment, therefore, and disendowment likewise, is

ıe cry and policy of the most active, though not the most ıoughtful, both of the Anglo-Romans and of the Irish Roman atholics. Cardinal Cullen and Archbishop Manning, who are mongst the most extreme Tories when the Roman Question under consideration; who with exaggerated rhetoric and uestionable discretion, write and speak of the dreadful ıcrilege involved in any proposed change at Rome, descend om their exalted platform to herd with Mr. Spurgeon the aptist speaker, and Mr. Miall the wire-puller of the Libera-on Society, when a dangerous work of destruction and violent ıange is proposed for the sister isle. Prelates of this stamp -so unlike Archbishop Murray, Bishop Moriarty of Kerry, ıd the late Bishop Doyle,—are unwittingly assisting in giving rength to a cry, and increased vigour to a principle, which in ıe end may turn to rend and destroy that which both we and ıey regard in common, as Truth from God. A Roman atholic who sincerely believes that unchecked liberty is a eneficent gift must be a strange phenomenon; and Roman atholic leaders who are short-sighted enough to call in the id of political dissenters, to assist them in the destruction of ı institution they dislike, may not improbably find out in the ıng run that equally incongruous alliances may be formed in ıe future, to cripple their own political and religious freedom, ıd to raise anew the banner of persecution. The Liberal prelates f France in 1760 adopted a similar policy: but the Roman atholic religion in that distinguished country can hardly be ıid to have benefited by the alliance when an undraped ourtezan was enthroned on the Cathedral High Altar and ıe streets of Paris flowed with blood. Quite comprehending ıe causes of the bitter rancour of Archbishop Manning and is satellites,—whose prophecies regarding the Catholic evival in England have so notoriously failed and been so tterly brought to nought,—we cannot hold that the principle f doing evil that good may come ought ever to be consecrated y the approbation and action of a successor of the apostles. is not the duty of a Christian bishop to destroy in any part f his native country the public recognition of Christianity y the State. It ought not to be the action of one who once ceived the eminent graces which he so notoriously possesses ırough the ancient Church of his own land, to join in the verthrow of a godly and time-honoured principle, in the ain hope of being able to set up what he regards as a more erfect principle in the future. It is sometimes wiser to ear the ills we have to endure than to fly to others we know ot of.

1868. s

From an Anglican point of view, the policy of the Liberals in general, and the Whig Roman Catholics in particular, deserves thought and consideration for several reasons. In the first place, when the formal disestablishment of the Irish Church has been effected, the English Church will not in its present form remain long connected with the State. On this point all the Liberal papers of advanced opinions are clear and unanimous. Even the Wesleyan organs speak out with definite force; while the Roman Catholics at once prophesy evil, and loudly exult in our downfall:—

"The disestablishment of the English Establishment," remarks the *Weekly Register*, in a leading article, "is simply a question of time. It may not take place this year, nor next, but come it must, and that ere many years are over. We do not say that justice demands the abolition of the Anglican State Church in England as imperatively as it does in Ireland, but still there are circumstances connected with this country and with the Church of England, which will cause its severance, quite as certainly as in the case of the Sister Island. In the first place, the Irish Church, with all its faults, is what the English Church can never pretend to be—it is united within its own camp. The same can certainly not be said of the latter Establishment."

In opposition to such wishes, hopes, and anticipations, there is of course the rash but not impossible alternative proposed by Dean Stanley—an alternative which, considered in its strictly logical conclusion, clearly implies a denial of the truth of Christianity altogether. Step by step, by slow or quick degrees, as the temper of public opinion permits or suggests, the work of broadening the Church of England may be unhappily planned and boldly carried out. Ritualists may be tolerated, even by the Privy Council, in which Archbishop Thomson and Bishop Tait would be the theological assessors,—in order that the followers of Mr. Voysey, Dean Stanley, and Dr. Colenso might equally obtain license and toleration. The bond of communion would be an universal liberty to teach as opinion everything or anything, as The Faith nothing. The process of arriving at this state of affairs might be long or it might be short. The goal will evidently not be reached all at once. Many will drop off, here a batch to one community, and there a batch to another. What may harass and distract one mind will hardly move a second: while what would not move one might very gravely influence more. Blow after blow, however, will come, if Dean Stanley is to triumph; and so the best and the noblest, the

truest and the most high-principled will be gradually drawn away. Our Church's life-blood will be lost, and the end of such a state of things who can forecast?

Of course a large number of persons—supposing this policy to succeed—will ally themselves with the modern Roman Communion in England. There the dogmatic principle will be found—thither, consequently, the steps of the faithful will be directed. The attempt which is being made to obtain a Bishop of the Greek Rite in England may succeed, and some may join the Orthodox Church. Anyhow, when that which was once the ancient Church of England becomes —God avert the danger!—a mere creedless sect, all who love the Truth as it is in Jesus, and value their souls' salvation, will heed the warning, "Let us depart hence."

The position of affairs which renders such a state of things, we do not say *probable* but *possible*, has been mainly brought about by the too general neglect on the part of the clergy of the value and bearings of political truth. We need not stay to point out how a well-known politician, who began life as a Tory, now finds himself supported on the one hand by Mr. Bright, and on the other by Mr. Beales. A more complete and startling change could not be conceived. And yet too many are not startled at all. The *Guardian* newspaper, with a tact, discrimination, and unscrupulous ability positively amazing, has all along set itself the task of defending any and every position that its political hero might think it needful or politic to assume. Whatever chanced to be the hue of the chameleon, the *Guardian* was always ready with a plausible explanation and an adroit defence. Clergy who were Conservatives were continually being informed how extremely unwise and impolitic it was to ally themselves with any political party: while no reasonable opportunity was lost of cleverly attacking the known leaders of the Constitutionalists. For Mr. Disraeli the most malignant and bitter sayings were cleverly concocted and judiciously published. Misstatements the most flagrant have been reiterated again and again; until many persons, not caring to inquire, have been duped into accepting them as infallible truths. Thus the old alliance of the Church of England with the Tories has been partially broken up and successfully damaged. Hence the National Church, placed between two stools, and depending for a safe seat wholly on neither, is in a fair way of suffering from the obvious unwisdom of her political position.

Of one point we may rest assured, that the disestablishment of the Church of England—the scarcely-concealed Liberal

policy—is a certain bar to the great idea of Corporate Re-union ever being carried out. Disestablishment infallibly brings about the practice of individual secession. For it is quite out of all reason to suppose that the great parties in the Church of England would long remain in one communion, when the work of disestablishment was effected. Confusion worse confounded would come to pass, with perhaps a small community, like that of the Protestant Episcopalians in Scotland,* taking the place of the old Church of St. Augustine and Bede.

If we were asked for our remedy regarding Ireland, our answer would be as follows, and it is made, after no slight thought, with an eye at once to Justice and Truth as well as to Corporate Re-union :—

Let the Establishment remain endowed, with some of its surplus revenues handed over to the Irish Roman Church. Where Establishmentarians are few, let buildings and property be freely given up to the Roman Catholics. So let the latter be publicly endowed likewise. Let a certain number of the bishops of each portion of the Church be made peers of Parliament and sit in the House of Lords. Though some of the Roman Catholic authorities have declined a similar proposition, we have good reason for knowing that this would in due time be generally considered and accepted. Thus the seed might be now sown of Peace and Amity—to bring forth good fruit—even external re-union amongst members of the one family, in the future.

4. We now proceed to consider briefly *Our relation to Rome in regard to Secessions.* The complex character of the Church of England—it being thought to be partly Protestant and partly Catholic, or, in other words, both Protestants and Catholics undoubtedly existing side by side in it,—naturally causes occasional secessions, more especially at periods of

* The following is from a Petition to Parliament, drawn up by Bishop Wordsworth, and signed by seven of the Scotch bishops, against disestablishing the Irish Church. The parts in italics deserve special attention :—" That we are deeply conscious, most especially, of the weakness which the cause of the Constitution suffers (as regards the connection of Church and State) from the want of unanimity in religious profession *among those who call themselves by the name of Protestants; and still more, from the establishment in Scotland of a form of Protestantism different from that of the United Church of England and Ireland;* but we cherish a hope that the time is not far distant when a more enlightened estimate of Christian duty, and a more widely diffused spirit of mutual conciliation, may induce those who accept *the two great principles of a National Religion, and of the necessity of the Protestant Reformation,* to act together in substantial concord for the common good."

excitement and trial. To those, however, who, like ourselves, hold that the English Church is Catholic in doctrine, and an important portion of the One Catholic Family, secessions to Rome will be looked upon as a source of unmixed mischief. That they will occasionally take place until Corporate Reunion is sealed, however. should only be a fresh motive for labouring to promote and make successful the great movement in behalf of that most rational and Christian policy. (*a.*) We should never forget that the historical and doctrinal continuity of the Church of England is a point capable of the most ready and clear reproof. On this subject, Mr. Parry Liddon recently wrote as follows in the *Guardian.** "He" [that is a writer with whom Mr. Liddon is discussing the question of University tests] "seems to imagine some transfer of property at the Reformation period, from one Church to another Church, from the Church which the Reformers are supposed to have destroyed to that which they are supposed to have invented and set up. Now I do not read History in that way; if I did I certainly should not continue to be a member of the Church of England for twenty-four hours longer. That the Church of England before and after the Reformation is one and the same body is the verdict both of History and Law." If the English Church came to an end at some particular time, it would be extremely interesting to know expressly and exactly when so important an event took place. We do not want bold assumptions or daring rhetoric, but plain and reliable facts. We are quite aware that a hundred-and-one assumptions are continually being trotted out for the use of Archbishop Manning and his modern community, but while they may serve his purpose with the ill-informed and imaginative, they do little more. We do not need rash, bold or politic assertions, but sterling truths and undisputed realities. If, as some gratuitously assume, the Church of England ceased to be a part of the Catholic Body, either under Henry VIII. or Queen Elizabeth, why were not the Sees which were vacated at once filled up? If the highest officers in a diocese or portion of the new Anglo-Roman Church lost the faith and lapsed into error, other rulers would at once receive authority to govern in the place of the lapsed. And if the Roman authorities in the sixteenth century had held Dr. Manning's opinions, they would have acted in the same way, whereas we know that they did exactly the reverse.† That there had been

* April 22, 1868.

† The sees were not filled up: though a "Bishop of Chalcedon" was afterwards sent here.

a schism of some sort, and that both sides regarded the schism as existing, no one can doubt; though neither side, each being a disputant, could faithfully apportion the blame of the same. The Church of Rome cannot impartially judge the Church of England; nor, on the other hand, can the English Church judge the Church of Rome. A future General Council, in which all bishops shall have a place, can alone settle the disputes of past ages, so deepened and intensified by political considerations; and to this remedy, in God's time coming, good men of all parts of the Christian family look forward with hope and consolation. (*β*) As to the validity of English Ordinations we can only maintain that a false tradition amongst Anglo-Romans alone guides present opinion on the subject. This tradition, created by Sanders, Stapleton, and Harding, has been accepted as true by our Roman opponents ever since. The only formal enquiry and deliberate judgment pronounced on the subject was that in the case of John Clement Gordon, Protestant Bishop of Galloway in Scotland, who having left his communion for that of Rome solicited a decision in favour of the *in*-validity of his orders from Pope Clement XI., who referred the question to the Holy Office. The Memorial, or Petition, printed at the end this article, from an attested copy, is so full of the gravest and almost unpardonable errors of fact, that any judgment delivered upon so purely an *ex parte* statement is simply of no value nor importance whatever. If any Roman Catholics, holding to an erroneous tradition, still deny the validity of our orders—and this in the face of the great religious revival which has brought to nought the dark prophecies of the early seceders—by all means let them set forth their reasons in plain and clear language. We have, and are prepared to give, an answer. Or if they would prefer it, let six theologians on each side be assembled to investigate and report on the subject. This is but the repetition of a challenge first made in the reign of James I., repeated under Charles I., and again under his son—but never accepted. It is not likely that Anglicans will pay the smallest attention to so glaringly one-sided an Opinion as that already referred to. Whether Anglicans are priests or not is a question of fact. If they are priests, the opinion of Archbishop Manning, or even the Pope himself, cannot alter the fact. It is easy, on the other hand, to print assumptions and to propagate doubts—doubt may be thrown on any subject—but it is absolutely impossible to wipe out page after page of History, or so to pervert History as to damage a theological opponent. English theologians

are quite as competent to defend their own of the question as the officials of the Holy Office, and whenever an impartial tribunal is set up or a fair attempt is made to investigate with impartiality the question, English Churchmen will be foremost in standing forth with evidence and proof both Historical and Theological. Nor will the opinions recently given by Russian theologians be without their proper bearing on a question with regard to which the Orthodox Church is certainly both a valuable and impartial witness. (γ.) The dispute which brought about the English Reformation, and which still practically separates England from Rome, is the Papal claim to universal supremacy. On the Anglican side, as also on the Greek, it is impossible to admit that the Bishops of Rome have from the beginning exercised jurisdiction, *jure divino*, over all other bishops; or that the Church Universal has ever held that none are true bishops, with a legitimate jurisdiction, who are out of visible communion with the See of Rome. Even the Council of Trent, after it was discussed, declined to approve of this proposition. Such a claim may be reasonable or unreasonable, wise or unwise, calculated to promote peace or the reverse, but it is certainly one which the whole of the Eastern Communion, comprising four out of the five patriarchates, has always formally and continually repudiated. When, consequently, it was practically denied and cast off in England, the precedent of the East was no doubt not lost upon those who accomplished the change. If both Roman Catholics and members of the Church of England will only consent to look beyond the circles of their own respective communions, and labour to provide the greatest good for the greatest number, the hope which the Bishop of Brechin has so forcibly and charitably set forth in his work on the Thirty-Nine Articles, with regard to the proposed Council—not general, but local, if only Rome is to be represented at it,—may yet be realized. We need scarcely add how cordially we trust his present mission to the Holy See on behalf of so many of the Anglican and Scotch bishops and clergy may be successful. A good theologian, a clever diplomatist, and an adroit and polished gentleman, he may do much if his own national and natural timidity be not sometimes a bar. Anyhow, individual secessions, based as they not uncommonly are on pride and selfishness, and brought to pass by personal disappointment,—'Verts must excuse our plain speaking—can do little good in remedying the miserable divisions existing in, and so grievously afflicting, the Christian Family. They may enable some who are tired of work and warfare to live in quiet indolence, and

others, who have been Conservatives both in faith and politics, to become members of that noisy chorus which glorifies the Whig leaders of Anglo-Roman Radicals. But this is all. When in England Liberalism,* through the co-operation of the infatuated and inconsistent admirers of Italian absolutism, has triumphed even unto blood, it will be too late to mourn over the work of destruction, and useless to attempt the erection of any new building on the ruins.

5. *The Natal Scandal.*—Putting aside the scarcely concealed aim of the Broad Church party, represented by Archbishop Thomson, Bishop Tait, Dr. Stanley, Dr. Colenso, Mr. Maurice, and Mr. Voysey, we cannot but be thankful that recent occurrences with regard to this scandal have given the death-blow to Protestantism in England. Whatever be the obvious disadvantages, and they are many, this one advantage is by no means inconsiderable. There are few events, however, more painful to contemplate than the attitude of the Bishop of London, whose *dictum* with regard to not being out of communion with Dr. Colenso is only on a par with the notorious *dicta* of other Whig bishops. This saying is of momentous importance, and will neither be soon forgotten, nor exist without bearing fruit. It has not only sent several laborious and high-minded clergy into the ranks of Archbishop Manning, but has already seriously damaged some of the oldest of our Church societies, as well as that one-sided organization known as the "Bishop of London's Fund." As regards the position taken up by the noble metropolitan of South Africa, nothing could be more edifying or full of consolation. He has stuck to his colours most valiantly. As a defender of the faith and confessor very few of the present day can be regarded as his equal. His action and bearing remind us of some of the greatest saints and doctors of old. Waspish criticism and episcopal misrepresentation have only served to bring out more clearly the high motives for his conduct and the masterly breadth of his policy. One fault only, and that a venial and pardonable fault, we have to find, viz., the too great desire to obtain the support and co-operation of the English prelates manifested by himself and the Bishops of South Africa. For if, as we assume, and could easily prove, that Province is as complete and perfect an ecclesiastical organization—not created by Letters Patent, Privy Council Order, or Act of Parliament—

* Dr. Herbert Vaughan, in his able pamphlet, the title of which stands at the head of this article, sufficiently sets forth the aim and objects of Liberalism with regard to Education. It would be well for all our readers to study this remarkable essay.

the Province of Canterbury or Armagh, we are at a loss to ıderstand, except on the repudiated principles of the Roman ıria, on what plea the Province of Canterbury, for example, ıs a right to claim, or the Province of South Africa a right allow, the power of *approving* or of *affirming*, (both these ;pressions have been used,) the formal judgment pronounced Cape Town deposing Dr. Colenso. The Province of Canterıry might be asked to *receive* the sentence: but Canterbury ıs no inherent nor delegated power to *affirm* the sentence. ne Province cannot sit in judgment to *revise* the formal ıcision of another Province, otherwise litigation would never ıme to an end. After a Province has given judgment, only a eneral Council can, on the unquestioned principles of ancient ınon Law, revise or review the same. Other Provinces may cept or reject the judgment and sentence: and it is most ıportant they should do so, because by such action, or the verse of such action, the general mind of the Church Unirsal becomes publicly and officially known. Let the bishop ıd his suffragans set to work at once in consolidating their posiɔn; let the Bishop of the Orange River Free State, [*what* a title!] ıd Bishop Tozer be formally received into the province; let her bishoprics be set up; and the Church of South Africa ll be known and spoken of when the miserable Erastianism Anglican dignitaries has been long ago forgotten. Faith ıd love in the Past shall merit more in the Present. And so e Future shall be glorious when Corporate Re-union has en effected.

6 and 7. *The Ritualistic cases and the prosecution of Mr. ennett.* On the great Ritual Question, which we are afraid s been unwisely allowed to obscure others of greater moment* the minds of some, we can make Mr. Colin Lindsay's words, ıich follow, our own. They are part of an Address delivered : him at the April meeting of the English Church Union on s resignation of the Presidentship. Before we give them we nnot allow the opportunity to pass of testifying our sincere miration for the bold and able defence of Catholic Faith and actice which he has so cleverly and constantly made, as well for the signal and important services rendered by him to e good cause as President of the Union. The desponding ne evident in some parts of the Address is not ours. Had true political policy been adopted by High Churchmen, no sponding tone need have been adopted at all. As men have vn politically, so have they reaped. Here are the ex-Prelent's valuable remarks on the subject of Ritual:—

* *e.g.* Mr. Coleridge's Universities' Tests Abolition Bill.

"The Ritual question is one which, you will agree with me, is of great importance. To abolish Scriptural and Catholic Ritual, and at the same time to maintain *unimpaired* the Catholic Faith, is, in my humble opinion, a great delusion. They both go together: and if one falls, both will fall. The unfortunate compromises made by our divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to satisfy the Puritans, have resulted in the partial obscuration of the true faith in the Church of England. With the loss of Lights, Vestments, and Incense, the doctrine of the Objective Presence of our dear Lord, under the form of bread and wine, has been almost forgotten by the majority of Churchmen; the Sacrifice of the Altar, *i.e.* the shewing forth sacrificially the Atonement, has been but little esteemed; and with respect to the great Eucharistic Service which our Lord instituted, another has been substituted, which, however beautiful and edifying it may be, was ordained 'only by man's authority.' As it has been in former times, so will it be in the future of the Church of England, if any radical changes be made in her Ritual law. With the abolition of the symbolic *ornamenta* of the Church, doctrinal loss will be the result; and the great movement now going on will become stationary, and will gradually cease. Let us not then deceive ourselves in this respect, but let us labour the more earnestly to maintain the whole 'tittle' of our Ritual Law, as it shall be interpreted by the only authority we can recognise, 'the Church of God.'"

The proposed prosecution of Mr. Bennett is a step of very great importance—more so possibly than its rash and blind promoters in the least degree imagine. The Gorham case brought about the adoption of a base and wicked non-natural interpretation of our formularies on the part of Low Churchmen, which in just retribution has culminated in Dr. Colenso's treatment of Holy Scripture, and in Mr. Voysey's interpretation of our Blessed Saviour's sayings and teaching. The Essays and Reviews Judgment secured a license which is certainly new in the Church of England. In reference to Ritual, the Puritans have been continually foiled. When appeals to law brought no advantages, and appeals to the low passions and prejudices of ignorant mobs became the policy of the rump of a once reputable school, it became no difficult labour to forecast the end. Protestantism is simply undeveloped Infidelity, and so it will turn out here. What may happen in Mr. Bennett's case it is impossible to say. His own principle of action and policy seems to be set forth very lucidly in the following extract from his public Letter to Dr.

Pusey, the whole of which manifesto deserves special attention :—*

"And what would be the issue? Unity and combination is the end proposed. The severing of the Church into such fragments as would make it difficult to know whether any Church at all remained would be the end achieved. Proceed by any system of compulsion, and one or other of the contending parties must eventually be cast out. Press too closely home those great sacramental observances which the one party holds dear on the other which understands them not, and the conscience of the party overwhelmed with the unknown burden would give way, and the Church would quickly be abandoned for Dissent. While the two great wounds of schism exhibited in the time of the Puritans and of John Wesley are still bleeding, is it a time for the extreme advocates of Ritual to force their opinions on the weaker brethren? No. They do not, they will not. They desire it not. They only plead for toleration for themselves. On the other hand, would those of whom we speak, the Calvinistic or Protestant party, and the Bishops who represent them—would they, looking upon the many devoted and religious Priests who have gathered a multitude of zealous followers around them, realizing in the English Church and within her just limits the catholicity which they love—deprive them of the power which as yet remains to them, of fulfilling the solemn obligations of their ordination vow? These men, strong and determined, are deeply impressed with a notion, that while their lives are holy, and their good works among the poor abundant, they may stimulate and keep alive the faith which they profess, by such religious exercises and devout ceremonies as are within the permission of the Church. Will the Church grudge them that privilege? Will those who have power use it recklessly against them, simply because, in the eyes of the vulgar, there is a childish cry about Rome?

"If it should be the case that by a coming legislation manufactured by the State without the due synodical action of the Church, a legislation which should not be Apostolical, nor ecclesiastical, nor just, these men should be cast out of the Church: that with their devotional and self-denying lives on account of obedience to what is undoubtedly the law at present they should be deprived of their benefices, and their flocks scattered—what it remains to ask, must inevitably be the

* The statement at p. 3, that the "Presence of our Lord upon the altars of our churches" is "visible" is evidently a slip of the pen or a printer's error.

issue? Multitudes of souls now faithful to the English Church, but then, as there would in reality be no English Church, but only *a Protestant sect*, would be daily, not as hitherto in single driblets, but in unanimous crowds, filling up the list of converts to that which alone in such a case (which God forbid) would become the Church of Christ in this land. Eliminate the Catholic element and disperse it by unsettling the minds of the faithful, and what would remain? *The Establishment.* But would even that remain long? Would it be strong enough as maintaining dogmatic faith to hold its own, or in pointof fact would it have anything to hold? Zeal and fervour, life and energy, learning and determination, would assail it as an army on its two flanks, and it would be cut to pieces in a few short years by Romanism on the right and Dissent on the left. It could not stand the brunt of those two foes, left thus to itself. A Parliament elected by household suffrage and without religion would not long defend it in its revenues, its cathedrals, its rich deaneries, and its well endowed bishoprics. All would soon become the prey of the Philistines, for there would be no principle or position of defence within it—a dry tree without sap, a skeleton of bones without marrow, a crumbling heap of sand without stability."

With regard to the current report, which certainly has some ground of foundation in this extract, that Mr. Bennett may decline to plead before a secular court as to the truth of Catholic doctrines, of course we are fully alive to the importance and value of such a course of tactics. On the other hand, there is the danger of alienating many who would be warm allies, by what may look a little quixotic. For there being no precedent in England for such a policy, the dangers accompanying its carrying-out must be huge, if not appalling. One point is quite clear, however, that it will be far wiser for Mr. Bennett to keep his counsel as to the proposed plan of defence, than to entrust his defence to the English Church Union. The Union is very influential, and represents a large section of the High Church party. But it is notorious that some sections are wholly, or almost wholly, unrepresented on its governing body. And when a question which concerns the union of Church and State, as well as its probable dis-union, crops up most unexpectedly, regarding doctrine, all sides should have a voice in determining the course of action. A bolder or abler champion of the Catholic Religion than Mr. Bennett, however, could not be found. He has never failed, and never faltered. While others have hung back, and declined to go

to the forefront, he has never shown the smallest hesitation as to immediately occupying that position. He has not simply preached and talked, or urged others forward—a very common policy with some—but has acted and gone forward most valiantly himself. Plain speaking has always been his, and not "the stammering utterances of ambiguous formularies:" hence the hatred and detestation with which the Puritans, in their serials, write of his teaching and works. Hence, in fine, the present prosecution.

And so, with cheering word of hope to him and all, we end. The crisis at present upon us is certainly momentous and threatening. But we do not fear. The skies are dark and the winds are wild and hollow. We are far from port. As Archdeacon Denison has so ably pointed out in his masterly and spirit-stirring Charge,* an almost judicial blindness has seized some of our guides. The man who was once a friend has suddenly become a foe. Where some saw security, they now find intensified dangers and perplexity that is deep. It is not the wildness of the storm around, however, nor the unusual blackness of the night, nor the clouding over of the stars, nor the weakness of the vessel, that makes our position so perilous. It is the false hearts and base motives of pretended friends on board—the loathsome kiss of the Erastian Judas, the scoffing misbelief of the reproduced inhabitant of Capernaum—the doubting Protestant. Let us note and remember this. For when we fully know the true state of our increasing dangers, we shall have taken the first step, by God's favour, to effectually meet and finally overcome them.

BEATISSIME PATER.

Joannes Clemens Gordon Scotus nuper Romæ ad fidem conversus ad pedes Sanctitatis vestræ humillime provulutus, exponit, quemadmodum Episcopatûs gradum in patriâ obtinuerit, ritu hæreticorum utcunque consecratus. Cum autem hujusmodi consecrationem opinetur esse nullam, ob rationem huic supplici Libello annexam, et summoperè desideret ex suo gradu dubio ac suspenso, ad certum statum Ecclesiasticum adscribi, Deoque et Ecclesiæ Catholicæ inservire, ideo

Supplicat reverenter Orator, ut Sanctitas vestra declarare dignetur, hujusmodi ordinationem esse illegitimam et nullam; atque secum, ut ordines sacros Catholico ritu suscipere queat, dispensare et Deus, &c.

Motivum, ob quod Anglicanorum Heterodoxorum ordinationes arbitratur Orator, cum plurimâ Catholicorum, imo et heterodoxorum parte, nullo modo validas dici posse.

* London: Rivingtons, 1868.

Ut enim validæ dici possent, non dubiè duntaxat, verum certo constare oporteret, apud prætensos Episcopos Anglos residere verum Episcopatûs Characterem; legitimam illos accepisse ab Ecclesiâ Catholicâ per successionem aliquam ordinationem, consecrationemque, et denique ab illis Pseudo-Episcopis adhibitum fuisse, ac etiamnum adhiberi essentialem in eorum consecrationibus, formam, materiam, intentionemque. Etenim, si quid ex tribus hisce, nimirum charactere, legitimâ consecratione, formâque, aut intentione desit, consecrationem dici nullam et invalidam cum Theologis omnibus fateri necesse est.

Quod autem primum spectat, fatentur hæretici, illius regionis doctissimi (utpote lumine veritatis convicti), nullam apud se ordinandi potestatem esse, quæ ab Ecclesia Romano-Catholicâ derivata in eos non sit. Id confitetur ingenuè Bridgesius Pseudo-Episcopus Oxoniensis in Defensione Regiminis, &c. p. 278. Ecce ejus verba: *Si fratres nostri Papistas tantum Laicos esse velint, erimus nos, et omnes ministri nostri, meri quoque Laici. Nam quis nos ordinavit ministros, nisi qui de eorum ministerio fuerunt? Nisi forsan a populo ministros fieri velint.* Quod ultimum negat Ministellus ille. At non est illi assentiendum pro illâ parte, quod ministerium a Catholicis (ut præ se fert) habuerint, cum nullam successivæ ordinationis rationem afferat. Hâc autem sublatâ, nulla alia consecrationis apud hæreticos istos extant vestigia, præter ministerium a populo, vel Principe Laico acceptum. Itaque, si nulla legitima ordinatio Consecratioque Sacerdotalis aut Episcopalis in illos manarit, ab Orthodoxis Romano-Catholicis Episcopis; igitur et nullum characterem, nullamque habent in se Consecrationem; atque adeo hanc in alios nequeunt valide conferre. Sed ne solis hâc in re (quod hujus dubii caput est) videatur Orator hæreticorum assertionibus inniti, invaliditatem Consecrationum his argumentis ex historiâ depromptis invictè probat. Constat, nullum Episcopum Catholicum in schismate et veræ Fidei Abjuratione Anglicanâ ad partes transiisse hæreticorum, præter unum Antonium Kitchin nomine, Episcopum Landaffensem, doctrinâ et scientiâ inter cæteros infirmum, qui tamen nefando muneri ordinandi a Regnia Elizabetha deputatus, tantum abfuit ut id exequeretur, ut cœcum se, adeoque imposito muneri imparem simularit, facinusque detestatus, nullis minis ad id unquam adduci potuerit (ita Hardingus in Confutatione Apologetica, Part II. c. 2). Id ipsum Stous, Chronologista Anglus subinde agnovit, etsi suis id Annalibus inserere, metu regiminis, non sit ausus, uti testatur nobilis vir D. Constabilis in Manuscripto proprio, pag. 13.

Agebat quoque sub id tempus in Turri Londonensi Archiepiscopus quidam Hibernus, quem propositâ libertate et præmiis hæretici deprecabantur, ut misertus orbitatis suæ Ecclesiæ

Ministros ordinaret. At vir bonus, inquit Sanderus de Schismate, pag. 400. *Nullo modo adduci potuit, ut hæreticis sacras manus imponerat, vel alieno peccato communicaret.* Cum autem hæretici sua se spe cecidisse viderunt, inito consilio in *Tabernam* ad *Caput Equi* in plateâ Cheapside Londini. condicto die conveniunt anno 1559, et quid agendum statuunt. Ac tandem tumultaris opere ex præsentibus (aderant enim plures) Joannem Scorium Apostatem Religiosum, haud Episcopum, deligunt, qui ordinationis speciem perageret. Is legerat ex Reformatis Tunii cujusdam librum secundum de Ecclesiâ, cap. 4, impositionem in Ecclesiâ manuum nihil aliud olim fuisse, quam dexteræ in dexteram, amicitiæ ergo, injectionem. Jubet itaque adstantes in genua procumbere, et apprehensâ cujusdam Parkeri laici dextrâ, *Eia*, inquit, *Domine Episcope Cantuariensis, surge.*

Pari modo aliqui ex iis, qui aderant, hoc ritu ordinavit. Ita accidisse testatus est oculatus testis Thomas Keal, Professor linguæ Hebraicæ Oxonii, cuidam suo amico Heberlei, cum uterque Religionis causâ exul ex patriâ in Belgio degeret. Prodiit quidem anno 1613, hoc est 54 annis post prædictum factum, liber Londini editus, cujusdam Formalistæ Angli, Francisci Masoni nomine: is prætendit, se in Archivo quodam invenisse Episcoporum successionem a Catholicis ordinatorum. Sed ab omnibus exploditur, quia nemirum sui dicti nullam probationem affert. Itaque illos constat, nullam ab Ecclesiâ verâ accepisse ordinationem validam, adeoque nec characterem ullam, ac pronide eorum ordinationes esse invalidas et nullas.

Adde, quod licet per successionem legitimam, aliquam hæreticus quispiam Ordinationem Consecrationemque Episcopalem accepisset (quod tamen nullo argumento probatur) Etiamnum eorum Ordinationem invalidæ dicendæ essent ob defectum materiæ, formæ et intentionis debitæ. Nullâ enim materiâ utuntur, nisi forte traditione Bibliorum, nulla forma legitima: imo formam Catholicorum abjecere, et commutavere in hanc: *Accipe potestatem prædicandi verbum Dei, et administrandi sancta ejus Sacramenta;* quæ essentialiter differt a formis Orthodoxis. Deinde, quæ intentio ab illis formari poterit, qui negant Christum aut primam Ecclesiam ullum incruentum instituisse Sacrificium? Sublato autem Sacrificio, tollitur Sacerdos, sublato Sacerdote, tollitur Episcopus, sublato alterturo *tollitur*, ut ail S. Hieron. Dial. contra Luciferanos, *Ecclesia, Fides et Evangelium.*

Denique constant semper in Anglia fuit praxis, ut si hæreticorum Ministrorum ad gremium revertatur Ecclesiæ, secularis instar habeatur. Unde si ligatus sit Matrimonio, in eodem permaneat; sui liber, et ad statum Ecclesiasticum transire velit, aliorum Catholicorum more ordinetur, vel si libuerit, uxorem

ducat. Ergo, etc. Feriâ 5, die 17, Aprilis 1704, in Congregatione generali S.R. et universalis Inquisitionis, habiter in Palatio Apostolico apud S. Petrum eorum Sanctissimo D.N.D., Clemente Divinâ Providentiâ Papa XI. ac Eminentissimis et Reverendissimis Dominus S. R. Ecclesiæ Cardinalibus; in totâ Republ. Christianâ contra hæreticam pravitatem generalibus Inquisitoribûs, a S. Sede Apostolicâ specialiter deputatis.

Lecto supradicto Memoriali, Sanctissimus D. noster Papa prædictus auditus votis eorundem Eminentissimorum, decrevit quod prædictus *Joannes Clemens Gordon*, Orator ex integro ad omnes ordines, etiam sacros et Presbyteratûs promoveatur, et quatenus non fuerit Sacramento Confirmationis munitus, Confirmetur.

JOSEPH : BARTOLUS, S. R.,
et Universalis Inquisitionis Notarius.
Locus ✠ Sigilli.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CHURCH IN SPAIN.

✠ J.M.J. D.C.

Rev. Sir,—A feeling of sincere sympathy for the Re-union 'ement now going on in England having induced me to ›me a subscriber to the Union Review, I received the first ıber of this year lately, through Mr. Lewtas, Bookseller, Rue Nova de Carmo, Lisbon. I was greatly struck with e of the articles, especially by the truly Catholic feeling ›le in many of them. I was not surprised to see a little testantism yet peeping out here and there, and especially in place, were there was an assertion that reminded me ngly of *Exeter Hall, et hoc genus omne.* But from the › of the rest of the article, I feel convinced that the writer been misled, and would be as happy to be set right as I am ›eing able to set him right.

What I refer to is a passage occurring in page 4, No. XXXI., uary, 1868.—

"The words of the Gloria Patri are an ascription of glory ıe due to the Supreme Being, and to say, *as they have done in in*, 'Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the y Ghost, and to the Virgin Mary, as it was in the beginning, " is deliberately to pay divine honour to a creature, beside ›lving a gross heresy."

Now, I am a Catholic Priest, of the third order of S. Dominic, Friar of an Order that has ever been distinguished for its ›tion to the Blessed Virgin: so you will believe me when ll you that the Church would never allow such a formula he above to be used in any case. As to its ever having been l at all, even by the most ignorant persons in Portugal or in, I can most confidently and firmly deny. Such a horrible phemy could only spring from the brains of some miserable ıt of the mischievous Anti-Catholic Bible and Tract Societies, are busy trying to upset the faith in this country by all .s of slanders against the Church. I have been in this ıtry twelve years; I was ordained here in 1858, and in 1859, : a short visit to my native country, North Wales, I returned er, and received faculties as a Missionary Apostolic to ch, hear confessions, &c., wherever I was called by the sh Priests, or the necessities of a district required a little .tual renovation,—in fact, what we call a Mission. Very

well: this kind of "roving commission," which is granted in the first place by His Holiness the Pope, and in the second is backed by the Bishop in whose diocese the Missions are to be given, gives a Priest great facilities for learning the spiritual state of the people. After having preached twenty regular Missions, besides several Lent and ordinary Sunday and Holy Day sermons; after catechizing, instructing, and hearing confessions for the last nine years, in the most neglected and corrupted parts of Portugal, that is, just about Lisbon, and here and there in the province of Estremadura, I can tell you I have never met a Portuguese sufficiently ignorant to utter such a blasphemy as that. Poor people! they have been sadly neglected by their clergy since 1834, when the suppression of the convents threw all the work upon the parochial clergy, who had up to then depended upon the Friars for the catechizing, preaching, and hearing confessions, and were themselves only accustomed to attend the Baptisms, Marriages, Burials, and the general supervision of their flocks. Since that time, the spirit of infidelity which has been sweeping fitfully but surely over Europe since 1790, has invaded this country. Every obstacle is thrown in the way of the ordination of Priests; men not choosing to teach and practise after a most worldly and time-serving fashion, are promoted to no dignities, all benefices being in the gift of the Government; and the consequence is, that the Parish Priests are fast becoming mere Government *employés*, attending more to elections and civil business than to the care of souls. But even in the midst of all this, though the poor people have been woefully neglected, still the faith is strong among them, and the old folk hand down to the young the pure tradition of doctrine as they received it from their fathers: and rare indeed is it to find a Portuguese who would not astonish some of your bran new theologians in England by the simplicity with which they would answer on the great Mysteries of our Holy Faith.

If this be the case in Portugal, it is still better in Spain, for the Spanish clergy have ever been more exemplary and better educated than these here; and as a missionary, I have had many a Spaniard at my knee, and can say that, as a rule, I have found them better instructed in their religion than Portuguese of the same class.

I say all this without bitterness, because I am sure the assertion arose from some mistake; for I thoroughly sympathise with the struggle for Re-union, the striving after truth, the anxiety for salvation, the true spirit of devotion, and the beautiful humility to be found in every page of the Union Review. I remember my own struggles to overcome old prejudices, the difficulty I had to throw off the old Protestant eggshell yet clinging to me as the son of a High Church but still very

"Protestant" clergyman in North Wales. In my time and in that country it would have been a perilous thing to hint that the Church of England was "Catholic," or that my poor father was a "Priest." What an uproar it would have raised in Rhoscolyn, Llanfairyeubwll, and Llanfihangelynnhywn! But, with the blessing God, I have crossed the Rubicon, and am safe in the Blessed Fold, where doubt and fear enter not. I have received my Orders from one whom I was perfectly certain was a Bishop, with succession and jurisdiction equally Apostolical. And the better to secure my salvation by having a holy work to do, and help to do it, I am professed in the Third Order of St. Dominick, *i.e.* in the Teaching Third Order, whose work is teaching, catechizing, and preaching missions, and attached to the venerable old house of Corpo Santo, now, alas! fallen from its high estate. Wearily, wearily are we working here to stem the tide of infidelity which flows deep and wide all around us, and is insensibly creeping even among our poor people here. God help us! it is difficult work. So we have a fellow-feeling for you in England, "on the other side of the wall," as you express it yourselves, and shall be only too glad to help you to pull "the wall" down altogether, so that there shall be but One Fold under One Shepherd.

I remain,
Ever most truly yours in Christ,
FR. H. B. M. HUGHES, O.P.,
Miss. Ap.

S. DOMINGO DE BENIFICA,
Near Lisbon,
February 18*th*, 1868.

"THE KISS OF PEACE."

SIR,—May I through the medium of your columns draw the attention of the author of the "Kiss of Peace" and of your readers to the following passages?

I. Mr. Cobb says, "The nutritive properties of a thing" are "its 'accidents' and not its 'substance.'" And again, "Latin theology and scholastic definition would in this case employ the word 'accidents.'"

S. Thomas Aquinas says (*Sum. Theol.*, pars iii. Quæst. LXXVII. Art. 5), "Quantitas dimensiva panis et vini . . . . . accipit *miraculose* vim et proprietatem substantiæ; et *ideo* potest transire in substantiam et dimensionem." And again he entirely accepts the following definition in the next article, "Alimentum *nutrit*, prout est *substantia* quædam, auget autem prout est aliquid quantum."

That is to say that S. Thomas, the angel of the schools and

the prince of Latin theologians, distinctly holds that in the ordinary language of metaphysics, a thing nourishes inasmuch as it is a substance; although in the case of the Holy Eucharist he believes that by a special miracle the accident of dimensive quantity (instead of the substance which on his view has ceased to exist), both generates and nourishes.

The following Latin scholastic theologians among others appear to agree with S. Thomas that, except on the supposition of a special miracle, it is the substance that nourishes: S. Albertus Magnus, S. Bonaventura, Alexander Alensis, Soto, Caietan, Pope Innocent III., Biel, Lugo and Suarez. I take the list from Dr. Pusey's wonderful work, "The Doctrine of the Real Presence from the Fathers," pp. 155—159. Apparently De Palude is the only one that maintained the opposite opinion.

It seems to me, therefore, that Mr. Cobb's statement that "Latin theology and scholastic definition would in this case employ the word 'accidents,'" is hardly warranted by the facts of the case.

II. Mr. Cobb throughout his book is perpetually trying to impress on us the fact that the doctrine of Transubstantiation asserts nothing more than the doctrine of the Real Presence, that it is merely the scholastic way of stating that doctrine. I do not say that this view is not correct, but I do say that if it is correct, the schoolmen were all wrong, and seeing that Mr. Cobb implies that "*he has* served his apprenticeship in scholastic theology," it is most marvellous to me that he should not have discovered so patent a fact. Take for example our own Duns Scotus, the "Doctor subtilis," the great patriarch of Franciscan theology: he says, (I quote Dr. Pusey's translation, pp. 18—21), "The truth of the Eucharist can be maintained without Transubstantiation;" and again, "In matters of belief handed down to us generally, a mode is not to be fixed upon which is most difficult to understand, and which is attended by more inconveniences. But that the Body of Christ is delivered to us in the Holy Eucharist is a truth delivered to us generally. But this way of understanding it, that the substance of the bread is not there, seems more difficult to maintain and more inconveniences follow thereon, than if we suppose that the substance of the bread is there."

Take again Cardinal Peter D'Ailly, the teacher of Gerson and the president of a (Western) General Council: he says, (I again quote Dr. Pusey's translation, p. 25), "It is exceeding (*valde*) possible that the substance of the bread should coexist with the Substance of the Body; . . . . it is plain that this mode is possible, nor is it repugnant to reason or to the authority of the Bible. Nay, it is *easier* to understand and *more reasonable* than any of the others, because it supposes that

the substance of bread conveyeth (*deferat*) the accidents, and not that the Substance of the Body of Christ doth so. And thus it does not suppose accidents without a subject, which is one of the difficulties here supposed. But if it be said, that it seemeth a greater difficulty that two bodily substances should be together, I say no."

Cardinal D'Ailly sums up by adopting Transubstantiation thus: "Although it does not follow evidently from Scripture that it is so," (*i. e.* that the substance of bread does not remain,) "nor either, as far as I can see, from the determination of the Church, yet since the Church rather favours it and the common opinion of saints and doctors, therefore I hold it."

III. Mr. Cobb says, "There cannot be two substances under one set of accidents," and this statement, he says, "simply asserts an independent law of reason," "a primary law of thought," only stated in the language of the schools. Now we have already seen Cardinal D'Ailly asserting that "*it is exceeding possible*" that two substances should co-exist under one set of accidents; but perhaps he stood alone? what view did the other schoolmen take of the matter? Hurtado, a Roman theologian of the seventeenth century, shall tell us. He says, (I quote Dr. Pusey's translation, p. 29,) "Scotus, Durandus, Richard a mediâ villâ, Sotus, Caietan, Suarez and Vasquez teach that the Body of Christ could be present under the species of bread, the substance of bread remaining under those species; because there is in this no contradiction or repugnance;" and Suarez says that "this is the more common opinion of theologians," (*i. e.* the possibility, not the fact, of co-existence.) Hurtado adds that "the Body of Christ not only can become present under the species of bread, the substance of the bread abiding under them, but moreover while It abides, It can be united with them."

IV. Mr. Cobb throughout his book teaches that the identity of the accidents can continue even when the identity of the substance ceases, and that it is possible to conceive of accidents being supported by no subject. Now what view of this matter do S. Augustine and S. John Damascene, the typical Western and Eastern Catholic metaphysicians, take? S. Augustine says, "The subject cannot be changed, unless that which exists in the subject be changed also;" and again, "In no way can form or colour, &c., detach itself from that subject in which it exists inseparably;" and again, "But perchance it may be that the subject perishing, that which is in the subject may remain. What shall ever persuade me of this?" And similarly S. John Damascene says, "Accident is that which *cannot* exist in itself but is contemplated in the essence." (The translations are from Dr. Pusey, pp. 261—264.) As Dr. Pusey remarks, no Roman Catholic would think of saying now, "Qualities *cannot*

exist without the subject in which they are," which are the words of S. Augustine.

I most sincerely hope, and in fact believe with Mr. Cobb, that in reality the Roman and the English Church agree on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist; but I must protest against the attempt to saddle us with a phraseology which must be utterly incomprehensible and misleading to an uneducated mind, and, as Duns Scotus says, "an occasion of repelling from the faith all philosophers, or at least an occasion of hindering them from being converted to the faith."

Of course if the Catholic Church shall ever define Transubstantiation to be of faith, one would submit to its decision at once and for ever, but considering that the Church has not spoken, and that, as Roman Catholics admit, (*e. g.* Melchior Canus, Biel, Scotus, D'Ailly,) the doctrine is not expressed in Scripture, and that, as Suarez says, "the old opinion was that the matter of bread remains," and that in fact, as Dr. Pusey shows, the fathers did not teach Transubstantiation but rather co-existence; and lastly, that the English Church in stating the doctrine of the Real Presence both in her formularies and in the writings of her doctors has ever avoided the phraseology of Transubstantiation, it seems to me to be the duty of an English Catholic to follow in the steps of tradition rather than to strike out new lines for himself, and to refrain at any rate from using the terminology of Transubstantiation in his public teaching, although as the question seems purely metaphysical, and the Church has never defined "co-existence" to be of faith, I suppose he may hold either view privately as a pious opinion.

Apologising for trespassing so long on your time, and, if you should insert this letter, on your space also,

I remain, your obedient servant,

February 28th, 1868. DISCIPULUS.

THE CONVERSION OF THE JEWS.

Sir,—Whilst there is so much desire now prevalent, I am thankful to say, to promote Unity in the Church of Christ, is there not some lukewarmness in endeavouring to bring the Jews into that Church? We are told that their bringing in shall be as "life from the dead," and do we not above all things in these days require the quickening of the deadening faith of the Church? I cannot help thinking that the comparative apathy shown on this point is owing in a great degree to the idea that it is a useless effort to attempt by *human means* their conversion. But is it so? Even should it please the Almighty to awaken the nation miraculously in a day, as many expect.

pursued to convince them that it is obtuseness (not constancy to the law of their forefathers, as they hold) that keeps them back from the Christian Belief, which *is* the belief of their forefathers fulfilled? Were they led to see, like their great countryman S. Paul, that they have verily continued in error because they thought they ought not to acknowledge Jesus as their Messiah, and that in so doing—conscientiously—they have ignored the highest honour that God could vouchsafe a nation, in that when it pleased Him to redeem mankind, it was a Jewish maiden, a daughter of Abraham, that He selected to bear the Divine Heir by Whom He effected that Redemption—that instead of *merely* granting to the Jews in their long looked for Messiah a temporal King who should emancipate their nation from a foreign yoke and restore "the kingdom to Israel," He gave *their* Messiah not only to be the "glory of His people Israel," but the joy of the whole earth, the King, not of Israel only, but of earth and heaven,—would they not fall down, as S. Paul did, in honest, manly, grateful repentance at the feet of their Divine countryman and acknowledge Him as their "Lord and their God"? Is it not because the Jews cannot believe the *greatness* of the honour vouchsafed them, that they do not see what all Christendom acknowledges? is it not that they require to have their view elevated, rather than ingratitude imputed to them? is it not ignorance rather than insensibility that causes apparent ingratitude in the compatriots of "the Lord our God"?

Would you kindly admit these suggestions from

Yours, &c.,

H. B.

ORIGINAL POETRY.

LATIN VERSION OF MR. H. F. LYTE'S HYMN.

"Mane nobiscum: quoniam advesperascit, et inclinata est jam dies.—S. Luke xxiv. 29.

Mane mecum: vesperascit:
Densa cœlum tenebrascit
Ocius caligine.
Curæ si deest levamen
Desolati Tu Solamen
Mane mecum, Domine!

Fugit dies inclinata;
Terra mœret, spoliata
Gloriarum gaudiis:
Sed dum mundus evanescit,
Brevis vita dum senescit,
Tu manes Immobilis.

Cito vicerit Temptator,
Ni per horas sis Salvator;
Nunquam Te non egeo:
Adjutore Te præsente
Vel per nubes dirigente
Vel per soles gaudeo.

Te juvante fugit metus,
Nec amarus augit fletus;
Vis malorum tollitur;
Et quid habet Mors dolorum?
Ubi virtus infernorum?
Si Tu mecum, vincitur!

Te per umbras cernam lucem,
Super astra sequar Ducem,
Quum tuenti ponas crucem
Sub caduco lumine:
Nunc e cœlis oriundo:
Sole nubes cedunt mundo:
Tu vivente, moribundo,
Mane mecum, Domine.

J. E. F.

ANGELS' GREETING.

Child of sorrow, heir of sadness,
  Welcome to the choirs above,
Minstrels of perennial gladness
  In the festive realms of Love:
We have watch'd thee on thy way;
We have heard thee weep and pray.

Other pilgrims came before thee;
  Others thought the journey long;
And we bore them, as we bore thee,
  On our unseen pinions strong,
From their first baptismal breath
To the last dark wave of Death.

Thro' the desert without fountain,
  O'er the hot and blinding sand,
O'er the bleak and ice-ridged mountain,
  O'er the sea-waste without strand,
Thro' the torture, flood and flame,
One by one, the pilgrims came.

All had crosses: some were lighter,
  Some were heavier; just as God
Found them weaklier, found them mightier
  To accept His chastening rod:
All had sorrow, pain, or loss;
None came here without his cross.

Many doubted if they ever
  Should the blissful bourn attain,
Fear'd to die, lest death should sever
  Them from their eternal gain,
Fear'd to live, lest life should win
Only the reward of sin.

Many felt that they had rather
  They had never seen the light,
Fancied God no more their Father
  Nor their friends the saints in white,
That their blessed first estate
Now was changed to reprobate.

Many used their eyes for fountains,
  Shedding salt tears night and day;
Many made of hillocks mountains,
  Intercepted on their way:
Many thought the ways of Heaven
Strangely hard toward men forgiven.

Many saw their offspring spurning
  Wisdom's yoke and pleasant ways,
Into dark misgiving turning
  Every hope of earlier days,
Hard and bold in vice, with no
Pity for their parents' woe.

Many feared their sins had dyed them
  With such deep and fatal stains,
That the fount of blood supplied them
  In Emmanuel's bursting veins
Had not power to lave and clean
Sinners such as they had been.

Many mourned their loves departed,
  Leaving none so loved behind;
Desolate and broken-hearted
  In their lonely shades they pined;
Pined, but murmured not, nor said,
"Would that we were also dead."

Many learn'd to fade and languish
  Ere the spring of life was past,
Lingered in mysterious anguish,
  Deep and deepening to the last.
Grace to bear the bitter grief
Was their sickness' sole relief.

Many fought with feud internal
  'Gainst a host of demon-sprites,
With incessant shafts infernal,
  Poisoning all their pure delights;
Fought, but never clear'd the field;
Conquer'd, only not to yield.

Child of sorrow, heir of sadness,
  Welcome where the pilgrims meet
With perennial hymns of gladness
  Round their Saviour's mercy-seat.
Thou hast toil'd and fought with them,
Thou wilt share their diadem.

Now no more a day of sorrow
  Spreads before thy waking eyes,
But the everlasting morrow
  Of the saints in Paradise.
God Himself no end can see
Of thy wondrous bliss to be.

Never through these gates can enter
  Sin or suffering, death or pain,
Fixed unfalling, as a centre,
  In thy God shalt thou remain;
Never can the Serpent creep
O'er the heavenly ramparts' steep.

Hear'st thou that unearthly singing
  Far in yonder fields of light
Whence we came to meet thee, winging
  Fleetly our enraptured flight?
Thither now our charge we bring,
And depose thee near our King.

Oh! how little now will seem thee
  All the anguish thou hast borne;
All will like an uneasy dream be
  Chased before the conquering morn.
Scarcely will thy memory keep
Trace of woe that seem'd so deep.

Go. He waits thee. Fall before Him,
  Overwhelm'd with rapture fall;
Ransomed, pardoned, saved, adore Him,
  For to Him thou owest all.
All the Kingdom hath is thine:
Thou thyself art made divine.

LITERARY NOTICES.

Father Lockhart's pamphlet on the *Roman Question* (London: Philp) has a value from one point of view, though of a kind exactly the reverse of what is intended by its amiable and accomplished author. It is not the least inconvenience of the indefinite prolongation of the temporary *status quo* in Italy, that it supplies a ready test for the use of the dominant party in the Roman Church to bully or cajole into subjection every one among their fellow Churchmen who dares to call his soul his own. There are very few who have the moral nerve to refuse, sooner or later, at least a nominal acceptance of their shibboleth. The present pamphlet is a case in point. We have far too high and sincere respect for the writer to have any desire to criticise in detail what is both intellectually and theologically unworthy of him, and is, indeed, a mere milk-and-water reproduction of the same extravagant theory Dr. Manning has familiarised us with *usque ad nauseam* in everything he has spoken or written—pastorals, pamphlets, speeches, sermons—for the last half-dozen years or more. When once Father Lockhart had unhappily consented to take a brief for the Ultramontane view of the subject, this was inevitable; that he should present it in a far less effective form than the Archbishop, was equally so, and is only to his credit. He has too much both of moderation and of Christian courtesy to indulge in the rabid denunciations and insolent dogmatism whereby its ordinary advocates supplement the weakness of their arguments. But a cause which has very little to be said for it in the way of reason cannot be forcibly maintained without the rough and ready weapons of dogmatism and anathema. It is very significant that a considerable portion of the essay (pp. 6—14), is taken up with establishing the *spiritual* claims of the Papacy—a subject in which the writer evidently felt more at his ease, but which is, of course, simply irrelevant in a discussion of the (purely political) "Temporal Sovereignty of the Pope." In fact, the pamphlet, like the Libyan eagle, carries in its bosom the implement of its own destruction. We are rightly told at the beginning that the temporal power grew up from "a concurrence of many circumstances manifesting the providential purposes of God, *and expressing the will of the Roman populations.*" Exactly so. The Temporal Power was undoubtedly a providential institution, and the will of God was manifested *through the will* of the Roman—or rather Italian—populations. By precisely the same indications of providential purpose we

ather now, that, in a wholly altered state of society, it is the vill of God for that institution in its mediæval shape to come o an end.* Nor will it avail to bring to the rescue that con-enient abstraction—which Father Lockhart has borrowed rom Dr. Manning—"the Catholic world." Without pausing o consider how large a proportion of the 170 million Roman Catholics would have first to be subtracted—twenty-four nillion Italians being a pretty good slice to begin with—it is uite sufficient to reply that everything which any part of the Catholic world really cares about would be just as well secured y "Rome and a garden," or even "the Vatican and a garden," s by the sovereignty of either the whole or the still emaining moiety of the Roman provinces. We are sorry to ee Saul for the first time among the Ultramontane prophets, nd the best wish we can form for him is a speedy return to etter and more congenial company.

A new an elegant edition of Sir Robert Grant's *Poems* have ust been issued by Messrs. Longmans. The reputation of this leasing writer having long ago been made, we need only call ttention to the present publication, which contains the un-nutilated and unaltered version of "Saviour, when in dust to Thee," far purer and better than those in which mistaken and injustifiable changes have been made.

Mrs. Cudlip's Tale, *A Noble Aim* (Masters), is extremely well old, by a writer at once graceful and refined.

Dr. Neale's Sermon on *Secession* (Masters), contains one or wo statements which we feel confident he would have altered nd modified before its publication, had he been still with us n the flesh. For it is notoriously inaccurate to declare that all persons who become Roman Catholics are expected to believe everything that Father Faber wrote about the pains of Pur-gatory.

Mr. Shipley's edition of *The Mysteries of Mount Calvary*, by Guevara (London: Rivingtons), is a publication of high value, being full of deep, thoughtful, and most pious reflections on the sufferings of our Lord. The translation is easy and good; the Preface interesting, and the whole book a valuable contri-bution to our increasing stock of devotional literature.

Mr. Tupper, the gentleman who by several is regarded as a poet, has published a set of Hymns which first appeared in

* The only real attempt at argument in the pamphlet is based on the cold reception given by the Romans to the Garibaldian raid of last autumn. But this argument is more than disposed of by the notorious fact that 15,000 Roman citizens (i. e., *over five per cent. of the native population*) are in exile, besides a large number of political prisoners. A despotic government knows in such cases how to select its victims.

the *Record* and the *Rock*, under the title of *Protestant Directorium*, (London: Simpkins). They are only remarkable for their witless vulgarity.

Most ably written, and attractive in style and argument, is a popular Lecture by the Rev. J. E. Vaux, entitled *An Open Bible*, (London: Palmer), which, being handsomely printed in a pamphlet of twenty pages and sold for a penny, ought to be circulated by thousands.

A Priest of the Diocese of Exeter has published a reprint of a French Essay, by M. Auguste Nicolas, on *Ritualism*, (Hayes). Full of sound philosophy and good Church teaching, it will no doubt prove both attractive and useful to really thoughtful persons of the upper and educated classes.

Mr. John Peat's *Sermons on the Beatitudes*, (Rivingtons), are exceedingly superficial and commonplace, though no doubt well intended.

Sermons on Subjects of the Day, (Dublin: Grafton), preached at the recent R. C. Council of Baltimore, though unequal in power and interest, are nevertheless a valuable contribution to the history of that Church in America, and will be acceptable to many Anglicans here.

Mr. Bennett's series, issued by Hayes, entitled *The Church's Broken Unity*, progresses very favourably. The new volume, on Wesleyanism and the Swedenborgians, is not the least interesting of those published. We know no series in which so considerable an amount of practical information is supplied in so small a compass, regarding those religious sects which exist around us, and concerning which so many otherwise well-informed people know simply nothing. For Parochial and Lending Libraries, this series will prove most acceptable. We earnestly hope that the offensive and ugly nick-name of "Romanism" will be changed for Roman Catholicism, in Part IV.

To the list of Messrs. Parker's useful shilling reprints of the works of Standard English Divines, have to be added Bishop Taylor's *Holy Living* and *Holy Dying*, which need no commendation from us.

The Canons of the First Four Councils, in Greek and English, (London: Parker), is a very valuable publication. We trust that the Bishops who assembled at Lambeth will henceforth frame their lives and conduct after the principles contained in them. Then may we hope for blessed days now, and Corporate Re-union eventually.

Lord Sidney Godolphin Osborne, the younger, has published a very clever pamphlet, *The Church Association*, (London: Hayes), which deals with the principles and tactics of that organization

n an exceedingly politic manner. None of the criticisms are vanting either in force or point; while some of them have hit he palpable blots of our Puritan aggressors with unquestionıble precision.

Queen Bertha and Her Times, (London: Rivingtons), is a 'ery pleasantly written monograph, displaying good taste, conıiderable archæological research, and an excellent Church feeling.)ur only regret is that the book is not large enough for an adequate treatment of a very interesting character. For the writer s always readable and seldom fails to express intelligibly what s written. We therefore commend the volume.

A Form for admitting Readers to their Office, according to the Use of the Diocese of Oxford, (London: Parker), founded on the model of our English Services as settled at the Reformation, might asily have been better if earlier precedents had been followed. As it is, however, it is appropriate and seemly, quite in "accordance with the spirit and temper of our pure and reformed branch of the Church."

Dr. Oldknow has long been known as a vigorous and able lefender of the ancient principles of the Church of England. He has also obtained a more than respectable reputation as a vriter of good Sermons. That reputation will be increased by a new volume, *Sermons on Various Points of Doctrine and Practice*, London: Hayes), just published. They are distinguished for an excellent literary style, accurate theological knowledge, and apt illustrations. Many of them are theological, and bear upon he controversies of the day. In all, the writer while speaking he truth with power, speaks it also in love.

Mr. C. M. Parkman, an American clergyman, has been so courteous as to send us a Sermon from his pen, entitled *The Lord Jesus, our Light and Life*. It is at once, orthodox, eloquent, and eminently practical.

The Inheritance of our Fathers, (London: Gardener), a series of sermonets on the Prayer Book, from the pen of Mr. Baird of Dymoke, deserve commendation. There is a tone of pious moderation and judicious caution about their statements, which some will respect and of which more will approve.

Archdeacon Wordsworth's very learned dissertation on the *Law of the Church on Ritual* (London: Rivingtons), is throughout grounded on a stupid fallacy, the existence of which any country attorney might have pointed out, who could have exercised sufficient patience to wade through an extremely dull and dreary essay, written apparently to apologise for the defects so patent both at Westminster Abbey, and Goosey, the writer's country living.

Mr. Charles Baker's Six Discourses for family Reading, *The*

Lake of Gennesaret (London: Rivingtons), while being orthodox, plainly written, and well-reasoned, are, in each case, quite adapted for the purpose for which they were composed. The fourth discourse is remarkable for being eminently practical and thoroughly earnest.

Mr. J. W. Chadwick's Sermon, *Absence from the Lord's Table* (London: Parkers), is an excellent specimen of a plain, sound, and practical discourse.

Dr. F. G. Lee has published an Assize sermon, *The Truth as it is Jesus* (London: Masters), preached by him at the appointment of Mr. De Lisle, High Sheriff of Leicestershire. It is a plain and logical statement of the first principles of the Christian religion.

Archdeacon Clerke's *Daily Devotions for a Churchman's Household* (London: Rivingtons), are not a success. It is far better to adopt old prayers and forms of prayer than for dignitaries who are a little at sea in such works "to excogitate compositions out of their own heads."

Long Resistance and Ultimate Conversion (London: Burns and Oates), appears to be the work of one who was more especially led to inquire into theological matters when he had made up his mind that the part is equal to the whole, or in other words, that the Roman Church and the Catholic Church are one and the same. The book, full of feeling but sadly deficient in logical power, is evidently the production of an honest man, with an incurably one-sided mind.

All people who thoroughly appreciate the opinion of the late Dr. Neale will be glad to procure his pamphlet *The Revision of the Lectionary* (London: Hayes), which, though fragmentary, is full of thought, sound judgment, and true wisdom on a point which is now under consideration by the Ritual Commissioners.

At present we have space merely to mention to our readers, and recommend to their special attention, *The Sarum Missal in English*, which has just been issued by the Church Press Company. We shall devote an article to it on a future occasion. In the meantime we may record our opinion that it is a most important contribution to the liturgiological treasury now so steadily increasing; being ably edited, carefully illustrated with valuable notes and additions, and extremely well printed. Far-sighted experience would have put the price of it somewhat lower.

ART. XVI.—*New America.* By WILLIAM HEPWORTH DIXON. Two vols. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1867.

THERE seems at first sight to be a pleonasm in the term "New America;" for is not America itself new, in regard to Europe? What then is the "new" America that Mr. Dixon has to speak of? Is there some phase of life, or of opinion, which shows a newer aspect even in this new country? There is: and it is this newer phase that Mr. Dixon describes. It is the development of new forms of religion, peculiar to the people of the United States of America.

The United States may be termed the hot-bed of heresy, of strange forms and perversions of the Christian Faith; there they germinate, they grow and flourish in a manner, and to an extent, that we have no conception of in the old country. The unbounded extent of land, the self-reliance of the people, the feeling that they, the people, are the sole source of power and authority in the country, and that they have shaken off the political traditions of their fatherland, naturally react on their religious feelings; they long for the same liberty in religion that they have in politics; the liberty to choose their own form of belief, their own ministers, and to model their religious communities after their own fancy. This is perhaps inevitable in a republican country: the Catholic Church is essentially monarchical in form, not only in the possession of the Episcopate, but also in the corresponding doctrine of the Apostolic Succession: for even when Bishops are elected, as in America, still the authority by which they exercise their office is derived from Christ, and not from the people. It is a fact well known, and openly deplored by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, that few, comparatively, of Irish emigrants remain Romanists after their settling in America.

They went out republicans, through dislike to British rule; they threw off their political allegiance to a superior power, and they do the like in their religion; they do not however seem to join largely any of the existing sects, or to fabricate new heresies; they seem rather to become indifferent to all religion. The uneducated and untrained mind requires a large amount of extraneous support to keep alive the seed of faith: when these are removed, the religious spirit of a man is often like that described in the Gospel, wandering in waterless places, "seeking rest and finding none." The Kingdom of

Christ is not such an one as the kingdoms of the world, but she is intended to live amid the kingdoms, and to influence them by her spirit: they were to be her support, and the support of her children, "kings shall be thy nursing-fathers, and queens thy nursing-mothers." They were to give her their alliance, to endow her with their wealth, to honour her with their homage: they were not to rule over her, not to control her, not to bring her into bondage.

The Church was born under the universal monarchy of Rome; over the whole civilised world there reigned one head, one ruler: there was one idea in the minds of all respecting the ruling power, and that was unity; however distant the province, however remote the Emperor, he was felt as the one head: each Roman citizen claimed the privilege of appealing from inferior courts to the one head. We do not sufficiently realise the wonderful Providence of God in bringing the Church to her birth, and nourishing up her young life, under the influence of a universal monarchy. Had Rome been Republican, it would have been hard to establish in the minds of the faithful the fundamental principle of the unity of all power in the Person of Christ, in the all-uniting headship of the Son of God. But, familiar with the principle in civil government, albeit it was heathen, they easily recognised the like in the spiritual. Not the less was it of the Providence of God, that the Faith should receive its final shape in the Six General Councils, at a time when that monarchy was still recognised, and the monarchs themselves were Christians. This doubtless helped much to ensure the universal reception of the Creeds throughout Christendom.

Nor was this without effect in influencing the heathen, and bringing him into the one Fold. The pagan Roman, or dreaming Oriental, who could reverence Cæsar as a god, as the presiding genius of that invincible earthly power, the Empire, nay, as the incarnation of that power, had a far easier task to learn in recognising the truth, that in the Incarnate God resided "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily:" still more readily, when that head of the earthly power acknowledged the heavenly, and gave his assistance to support it, did the Roman citizen follow his example. The fact was one which the Christians wisely acknowledged, and gladly accepted: the kingdom of the world appeared to become the kingdom of God. Even in our own time we may safely affirm, that the Church of England would not have retained the allegiance of so large a portion of our countrymen, through the dreary period of the last century, had she not carried with

her the prestige of being the "Established" Church, and the King her reputed Head.

In America, where the worldly principle of an establishment does not support the religious one of the Church, where Republican Institutions are in antagonism to Monarchical, where liberty degenerates into license, it is a natural sequence that the Church should often and to a great extent lose her hold on the allegiance of her children, and fail to gain that of the multitude, and then, having thus lost her hold, those who should have been her children should desert her to carry her supposed liberty into the wildest extravagance, and delight themselves in framing new forms of faith, new ways of worship, new communities of devotees. Man is constitutionally religious, he is δεισιδαιμονεστέρος, a worshipper of a deity: if he do not worship the One God in the manner that the One God has commanded, and hold the true faith that the One God has taught, then he will worship some demoniacal power, or he will worship the true God in some false and foolish manner. Some spiritual power superior to his own he will believe in, something he must worship. Persons who have thrown off the belief in a Personal God, in an active Providence, who have ceased to worship in the prescribed way, will generally fall into superstition; that is, will become believers in the power and influence of inferior spirits, real or imaginary; and this belief will go on to produce a constant fear, and even terror of their power, will excite a craving for intercourse with them, and a hope of their protection. This was very much the case of the educated pagan of Greece and Rome, at the time when the Gospel was first preached; the old deities, whom their ancestors had worshipped and believed in, had degenerated into mere poetical fancies, subjects for jest and scoffing: the 'mysteries,' into some of which numbers were admitted, taught the initiated to regard the gods as impersonations of the powers of nature, and not as living realities. The histories of the gods become a mere myth, clothing a phenomenon of nature. Driven from a belief in a Personal Deity, they naturally turned to other spirits, and magic engrossed the whole religious feelings of the men of that age. The books of magic burned at Ephesus were valued at 50,000 pieces of silver; and they could have been but a very small portion of those which the inhabitants of Ephesus studied. In the second century, Apuleius, a pagan, the author of the delightful "Metamorphoses," was himself accused and solemnly tried for witchcraft; and though he defended himself and was acquitted by his judges, yet he implicitly believed in

magic, and dreaded its power; while, as we may judge from his book, he believed in no personal deity, nothing more than the immortal mother, the ever-vigorous powers of nature. And such will inevitably be the religion of those who seek out a faith, and excogitate a religion of their own. They can see and recognise the natural laws that govern the universe; they can see in the regular return of day and night, the recurrence of the seasons, the reproduction and germination of animals and plants, the existence of a law, but they see no Personal God visibly interfering in the world; so He drops out of their speculations, and they dwell wholly on the visible evidences of regular law; the latter, not the law-giver, becomes their deity. But this never suffices for the ordinary run of men; a few philosophical thinkers, and a few unphilosophical men, unindued with strong and warm feelings, may be satisfied with such a religion as this affords; but men and women whose feelings and affections predominate over a cold-hearted intellect, find a want unsatisfied, a void unfilled. Abstract laws of an abstract "nature" fail altogether to satisfy those who have strong personal feelings and warm affections. They need a Person on whom to rely, to whom to pray, in whose love they can rest. Never having been instructed in the faith, and love, and worship of that One Person Who became Man for their sakes, they seek some inferior being, in whom they may trust, and with whom they may hold intercourse, to take the place of prayer to a Higher Power. Something like this seems to have been the state of religious thought in the beginning of the Roman Empire, before it believed in the Person of the Incarnate God; and into such, we have every reason to believe, will men and women again fall, when they repudiate or ignore Him. Man is not made to believe in an abstract religion, nor to worship an abstract deity. And into something very like this has a large portion of the inhabitants of the United States of America fallen. With the exception of the Roman and Anglican branches of the Catholic Church, we may affirm generally that the Americans have thrown off the Catholic Faith, and, what is perhaps even of greater importance, have renounced Catholic Communion, by deliberately rejecting the Sacraments. We who live in England hardly know to what an extent the people are unbaptised; unbaptised persons are not Christians, though they may call themselves by the name. This having the name, while renouncing the thing, is by no means a mere negative state of religion, it becomes positive in its opposition to a direct call and duty; a certain self-willed pride is fostered

and encouraged, an assumption of superior knowledge, and a presumptuous despising of the appointed means of grace as unbefitting and unnecessary for an intellectual being like man, is the state of mind to which such persons inevitably arrive; a state antagonistic, not only to the whole spirit of the Gospel, but to the Person of Christ Himself.

Here is a condition in every way fitted for the excogitation of some strange heresy, or for adopting some form of demonolatry: such heresies as Mormonism and Shakerism are the natural outgrowth of such minds as have thus renounced the Catholic Faith and the Communion of the Body of Christ. On the other hand, Spiritualism, table-turning, communication, supposed or real, with demons, or the spirits of the departed, are in reality the revival of the older forms of magic and witchcraft. The "Spiritual Magazines" are perhaps only counterparts of the Ephesine books which were burnt before S. Paul. Let us be understood as giving no opinion on spiritualism, whether it be true or not; whether it be the spirits of the departed or demons assuming their name, or whether the whole thing be an imposition and legerdemain; what we have to deal with is the fact that it is not only believed in, but that it really constitutes the actual *religion* of a vast number of persons, to the exclusion of the faith and worship of Christ.

It would be a curious, though perhaps not very profitable, task to draw a parallel between the modern heresies in America, and the ancient Gnostic perversion of Divine truth in the early ages of the Church. For these strange forms of religion have each of them a gnosis, on which rests their distinction from others: they have their scheme of perfection which the saints are to arrive at; like them there are the two schools, apparently opposite to each other, yet both springing from the same false principle, those who indulge the flesh, and those who deny its indulgence, the schools of Saturninus and Basilides; those to whom the words of S. Jude might be applied, and those described by S. Paul, as "forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats." There are Essenes, Encratites, Therapeutics; nay, we believe that almost every ancient heresy finds its imitators in America at this present day.

There is one point to be taken into consideration of more importance than at first sight appears, and that is the form in which Christian Faith has been generally presented to the people of America, and, to a great extent, to those also who have emigrated thither from this country and others. It is

something of this sort: people have been taught to believe in *Christianity*, as a sort of theological system; it has been presented to them as a series of sacred truths, which they were to believe. The divines of the last century were ever preaching about the "credibility" of Christianity; about its "reasonableness," its "moral fitness." Its "evidences" were presented as hard, dry, logical facts, which are to be believed because they were proveable. Again, "Christianity" is in the Bible, its doctrines are drawn from its pages; the Bible, standing alone, is the one source of all knowledge, instruction, and doctrine; all of which is to be proved from "texts" in the Bible. Thus religion became a mere intellectual system, utterly inadequate to satisfy the warm feelings and yearning love of those whose hearts were larger than their heads. Wesleyan Methodism was the natural revolt of heart against the autocracy of head; it was the outburst of the well of spiritual affection long pent up. The stories we read of crowds crushing together, standing in breathless silence, with streaming eyes, to hear of a Person Who loved them, lived for them, died for them; yes, and who could come day after day to hear the same story, to listen to the same words, can be comprehended only upon the fact that they had never been told before of this Person, nor His love, nor His pity: they had heard of Christianity, but they had not heard of Christ; they had been taught to believe in His doctrine, but they had not been taught to believe in *Him*. This was the great fact of Methodism, and of the early Evangelicals; and this fact accounts for the wonderful success and the immense influence which both these exercised. We at this present day cannot conceive it, for most of us, who are members of the Church, have no personal experience of Christianity without Christ; and when there is added further the desolate churches, the lifeless form of worship, the dreary Tate and Brady, the somnolent sermon, we shall perhaps somewhat realise what the Evangelical revival was in our own country.

It is not our purpose to enter further on this matter than to point out the singular fact that parties have in a great measure changed places, especially since the great Catholic movement in our own day. It is now that the Church teaches the Person of the Incarnate God as the object of worship, love, and reverence; it is the Protestant sects that teach the system of Christianity. Wesley never contemplated the formation of a sect, the entire separation from the Church, by his followers: they were to continue subsidiary to the Church, not antagonistic to her. As soon as they separated

and formed an independent sect, they were obliged to organize themselves into a system. Like the older Nonconformists, they have adopted the Bible as the sole and only source of all truth and law, and profess to frame their constitution upon it.

This last is a point of great importance to be considered in reference to the present state of religious ideas in America. The Americans have received Christianity as a system derived from the Bible, and have not received the idea of the Catholic Church as the spiritual Kingdom of Christ upon earth. Hence they think themselves at liberty to frame sects or communities after some model of their own invention, while professing to hold, and perhaps believing that they do hold, the doctrines of the Bible; they call themselves *Christians*, because they accept *Christianity:* they hold an intellectual system, without in the least degree understanding the meaning or the necessity of a spiritual union with Christ, as the Head of His Church. Such community is, in their estimation, *a* Church, whole and complete in itself, quite irrespective of other Churches or sects. The One Holy Catholic Church which we confess in the Creed, and in the sense that we confess it, they have not the least notion of. A Body with a visible succession of ministry, of sacraments, with a deposit of faith, kept whole and unbroken through centuries, is an idea which they cannot conceive, is a truth which they are unable to realize. Holding this idea of the Bible, that it is the one, sole, only divine authority, and denying the Catholic Church as the Kingdom of Christ upon earth, and consequently rejecting all traditionary interpretation of Scripture, all traditionary faith in the Church, we shall not be surprised to hear of the existence of the strangest heresies. When, further, they reject the doctrine that the Church is endued with divine authority to teach the One Faith, that she alone is the witness and keeper of Holy Writ, who alone has a commission to interpret Scripture, we may expect to hear of the most astonishing heresies, all professing to be derived from the Bible; depending chiefly on some mystical interpretation of it, quite different from its obvious meaning, and, in not a few instances, entirely opposed to it. Such a system is pure Gnosticism: and when once this system gains a hold on the minds of the people there are no bounds to the extravagances and the impiety which will be taught under the name of Christianity. Added to this there is a strong desire, very prevalent in a sect-making community, for the formation of a perfect Church on earth, in which all members shall be saints, all sinless. This is more or less the cause of the formation of numbers of those little sects, which occasionally crop up from the obscurity of

some back street in a large town. They want to forestal the future Kingdom of Christ, and make it present in this life; they want to reverse that assertion of our Lord's, "It must needs be that offences come:" they want to put off the discipline and trial of this fallen state, and enter at once into the perfect future. We shall see further on how this idea pervades many of the American sects, of which we have to speak. At present we cannot but remark that the idea, in a greater or less degree, pervades all sects, very markedly the Methodists: with them the first qualification of a "minister" is that he be a "converted man;" that he have "experiences" of grace, that he see "fruits" in himself. It is one of their standing objections to the reality of the Priesthood in the Church, that there are many unworthy members. The idea that the unworthiness of an individual can make void the ordinance of Christ, is one which all dissenters hold, though few would like to express it in plain language.

These facts make it evident that there is in America every provision for heresy, and that of the wildest character; there is every preparation of mind for it, everything which scoffs at authority, and upholds, and almost deifies, private opinion. There seems to be an absolute delight in the majority of Americans to strike out something new, to get beyond the old trammels of faith and reason. They exult in such manifestations, as proofs of the progress of the human mind, and their independence of ancient institutions. Mr. Dixon does not introduce us into a large number of sects, nor of the most extravagant; he confines himself to a few, studies them, and gives us his experience of them. In this he has done wisely, for we do not want a mere catalogue of a multitude of sects, or a hearsay evidence of their absurdities: a history of a few, which are really examined, is far more valuable.

He takes us first, as might be expected, into the city of the Mormons, and describes the life and religion which he found there. The first place to which we are introduced is the theatre; the theatre is an important institution among the Mormons, and the President has taken great pains with it. Lying under a sort of religious and moral ban in England, and still more in the United States, Brigham Young had very considerable difficulties to overcome before he could give it a religious character. To effect this he not only attends himself with his wives and children, but he makes his daughters act on the stage: he will not ask other families to do that which his own refuses to do. All the arrangements are carefully made, so that propriety may be most scrupulously observed.

"But the chief beauties of this model play-house lie behind he scenes; in the ample space, the perfect light, the scrupulous leanliness of every part. I am pretty well acquainted with reen-rooms and side-wings in Europe; but I have never seen, ot in Italian and Austrian theatres, so many delicate arrangenents for the privacy and comfort of the ladies and gentlemen s at Salt Lake. The green-room is a real drawing-room. The scene-painters have their proper studios; the dressers nd decorators have immense magazines. Every lady, howver small her part in the play, has a dressing-room to herelf."—Vol. i. p. 202.

But Mormon life is not a life of ease and pleasure; on the ontrary, it is essentially a life of labour and toil; nay, we nay say that hand-labour is the essence of every-day religion; vith them is far more realised the old saying, *laborare est rare*, than anywhere else. The following is a part of a 'Sermon" preached by Young to a band of newly-arrived migrants:—

"Brothers and sisters in the Lord Jesus Christ, you have een chosen from the world by God, and sent through His race to this valley of the mountains, to help in building up His Kingdom. You are faint and weary from your march. Rest, then, for a day; for a second day, should you need it; hen rise up, and see how you will live. Don't bother yourelves much about your religious duties; you have been chosen or this work, and God will take care of you in it. Be of good heer. Look about this valley into which you have been alled. Your first duty is to learn how to grow a cabbage; nd along with this cabbage, an onion, a tomato, and a sweet otato; then how to feed a pig, to build a house, to plant a arden, to rear cattle, and to bake bread; in a word, your first uty is to live. The next duty—for those who, being Danes, 'rench, and Swiss, cannot speak it now—is to learn English; he language of God, the language of the Book of Mormon, he language of these Latter Days. These things you must o first; the rest will be added to you in proper seasons. Iod bless you; and the peace of our Lord Jesus Christ be ith you."—Page 210.

Labour, in fact, is their religion; they have a creed, it is rue, and they have their peculiar doctrines; but the cultiating the land, building of houses, and making the land protable and their homes comfortable, is the real religion of the Iormons. Without such a religion, as Mr. Dixon shows, life ould be impossible in the Salt Lake Valley. Driven from Iauvoo, after the death of Joseph Smith, they emigrated to

this place: before they came, it was a howling wilderness; the march there, was, in itself, one of the most wonderful on record; the privations were fearful, the loss of life tremendous. Even now it is dreadful. "The waste of life is always great in the emigrant trains; even now, when the roads are made, and the stations provisioned with vegetable food. Of the train which I saw come in, six had perished on the plains. A young lady told me that eighty had died in the train by which she had arrived: forty would perhaps be an average loss on the mountains and on the plains."

This is, however, trifling compared with the loss and the privations of the first emigrants; nothing could have supported them but a faith in their prophet and a knowledge that there were enemies behind more terrible than the dangers in front. These last were in themselves fearful enough: "Beyond the Rocky Mountains lay a howling wilderness of salt and stones, a property which no white man had yet been greedy enough to claim. Some pope, in the middle ages, had bestowed it on the Crown of Spain, from which it had fallen, as a pauper waste, to the Mexican Republic; but neither Spaniard nor Mexican had ever gone up into the land to possess it. In the centre of this howling wilderness lay a Dead Sea, not less terrible than Bahr Lout, the sea of Lot. One-fourth of its waters was known to be solid salt. The creeks which run into it were said to be putrid; the wells around it were known to be bitter; and the shores for many miles were crusted white with sceleratus. These shores were like nothing else on earth, except the Syrian Ghor, and they were more forbidding than the Syrian Ghor in this particular, that the waters of the Salt Lake were dull, impure, and the water lines studded with ditches and pools intolerable to the nostrils of living men. To crown its repulsive features, this desert of salt, of stones, and of putrid creeks, was shut off from the world, eastward by the Rocky Mountains, westward by the Sierra Nevada, ranges of Alps, high as the chain of Mont Blanc, and covered with eternal ice and snow!"

Such was the Land of Promise to which the Prophet led his people; assuredly not a land flowing with milk and honey. Now this land blooms and blossoms with tree and flower, fields of corn wave, and gardens yield their produce, and cattle live and flourish; all this by the labour of man. Yet only by incessant labour and toil: one man can cultivate no more than four acres; the same man, on the banks of the Mississippi, could till forty.

"Thirty-six years ago there were six Mormons in America, none in England, none in the rest of Europe; and to-day (1866) they have twenty thousand saints in the Salt Lake City; four thousand each in Ogden, Provo, and Logan; in the whole of their stations in the valleys (one hundred and six settlements, properly organised by them, and ruled by bishops and elders), a hundred and fifty thousand souls; in other parts of the United States, about eight or ten thousand; in England and its dependencies, about fifteen thousand; in the rest of Europe, ten thousand; in Asia and the South Sea Islands, about twenty thousand; in all not less perhaps than two hundred thousand followers of the Gospel preached by Joseph Smith. All these converts have been gathered into this temple in thirty years.

"This power of growth—a power developed in the midst of persecution—is one of the strangest facts in the story of this strange people. In half the span of our life they have risen from nothing into a vast and vital Church. Islam preaching the unity of God with fire and sword, swept onward with a slower march than these American saints; for in little more than thirty years they have won a nation from the Christian Church; they have occupied a territory larger than Spain; they have built a capital in the desert, which is already more populous than Valladolid; they have drilled an army, which I have reason to believe is more than twenty thousand strong; they have raised a priesthood, counting in its ranks many hundreds of working prophets, presidents, bishops, counsellors, and elders; they have established a law, a theology, a social science of their own, profoundly hostile to all reigning colleges and creeds."—Pp. 212, 213.

Besides this, there is another fact equally strange to America, and foreign to all modern ideas and practice. Brigham Young has not only founded a state of great power and influence, but he has so founded it that the religious features are more prominent than the civil; or, to speak more correctly, the laws of the State are essentially religious; the State itself is a theocracy: a theocracy founded on the model of the Hebrew commonwealth, where the code of laws is at once civil and ecclesiastical. He has done this in a land where the mere establishment of any religious body is strongly repudiated as abhorrent from the whole mind of the citizens: nay more, he has set up himself as the highest functionary both in civil and religious matters; the High Priest is the Judge and Lawgiver; the laws of the State are the laws of God. Yet it is to this state, thus ruled by a self-appointed

ecclesiastic, that the children of republican America submit themselves; it is to the most rigid supremacy of a State religion, that English Dissenters flock, and obey with unquestioning obedience! Their whole nature seems changed; no more assertion of individual civil rights, or of liberty of conscience; no more factious opposition to a penny Church-rate in some English vestry; they obey cheerfully, and as cheerfully pay, not a penny rate, but a *bonâ fide* tithe, a tenth of all their produce.

We may well ask, what is the creed of these people, which draws its thousands of converts? What is the faith, which animates this powerful body? What is the religion, which exercises such a thrall upon this mass of men and women? Before answering these questions we shall give their creed:—

"1. God is a person, with the form and flesh of man.

"2. Man is a part of the substance of God, and will himself become a god.

"3. Man was not created by God, but existed from all eternity, and will exist to all eternity.

"4. Man is not born in sin, and is not accountable for offences other than his own.

"5. The earth is a colony of embodied spirits, one of many such settlements in space.

"6. God is President of the Immortals, having under Him four orders of beings: (1), Gods—that is to say, immortal beings, possessed of a perfect organisation of soul and body; being the final state of men who have lived on earth in perfect obedience to the law; (2), Angels—immortal beings, who have lived on earth in imperfect obedience to the law; (3), Men—immortal beings, in whom a living soul is united with a human body; (4), Spirits—immortal beings, still waiting to receive their tabernacle of flesh.

"7. Man, being one of the race of gods, becomes eligible, by means of marriage, for a celestial throne; his household of wives and children being his kingdom, not on earth only, but in heaven.

"8. The kingdom of God has been again founded on the earth; the time has come for the saints to take possession of their own; but by virtue, not by violence; by industry, not by force."—Page 265.

It is quite clear that this creed alone could not produce all the faith and enthusiasm of the Mormon: there are causes lying deeper than all this.

The whole Mormon system is one which adapts itself to this present life; the whole religion, if we may so call it, is

onfined to this present world; its promises are of comfort nd happiness here, peace and rest from all those accidents nd troubles which beset a labouring man in these old ountries. There is work and toil, no doubt, but it is not too ard, and its result is certain to produce a sufficiency. There s always at hand a large fund of money to set every one going, and to keep him from poverty: an industrious man is erfectly certain to attain competency, if not wealth. Besides his, there is none of the worry and harassing occasioned by erpetual competition, as in the old country; none of the unertainty, and often misery, of being "out of work;" of trikes, and of accident and sickness. Men who have gone hrough any of these trials, or lived in places where these rials exist, well know what a misery they are, and how they mbitter life. At Deseret they are almost unknown, and nissionaries from Deseret tell the people in this country that hey are quite so. In America there is another element of rouble—to some minds at least—the endless political agitaions. To men with no political propensities, who wish to be well governed, but have no ambition to share in the governnent, political agitation is an intolerable nuisance; it affects heir trade, their business, their very domestic happiness.

In a strictly religious point of view, there are attractions lso; it sets at rest for ever all anxiety about the world to ome. To become a Mormon, to accept the Mormon creed, o comply with Mormon rules, to labour regularly, to conduct himself decently, ensures salvation. No self-discipline, no 'working out of salvation with fear and trembling," are there o make life anxious, if not miserable. Then there is a rest nd repose from all polemics, all clashing of creeds, all endless lisputations: all "peculiar views" are tolerated, provided each ne keep them to himself, and do not try to push them down nother's throat. Here also comes in an element which is a ery powerful motive in the minds of many—here is a "perfect Church" on earth. Converts in England and America are lrawn chiefly from Methodist bodies: Wales affords the largest umber in proportion to its population of any part of England. Now one of the prevalent ideas of Methodists, especially the maller sects, is that of forming a perfect Church, a body to e composed wholly of "saints:" they separate from the Catholic Church, because its members are "unregenerate," 'unconverted;" because its ministers are "worldly." Here s what they have been looking for, a perfect Church, a body f saints: Mormon missionaries proclaim in the most glowing erms the perfection and the sanctity of the Latter-day Saints:

the idea seizes on their minds, and they accept the promise, they become Mormons. Then, again, they are removed from the harassment of classing sects, the doubt whether the sect they belong to is right, whether they are right themselves. Still more, in this country, they are removed from the disagreeable fact of their being looked down upon and despised by an Established Church to which they are hostile, from Church-rates paid to a religion in which they do not believe, but which they are forced in some way to acknowledge. They see their "chapel" and their "minister" looked down upon by the Parish Priest and the "Church folks:" they go where no such degradation awaits them. Lastly, they are removed, once and for ever, from all fear of Hell and eternal torments: no Latter-day Saint will be damned.

We might add more, but the above is, we think, sufficient to account for the immense growth of this body: and this attractiveness is, apparently, owing to the skilful management of its Prophet, Brigham Young: for under his hands it has wholly changed its character. Joseph Smith intended to found a fanatical sect, like Joanna Southcote; his assistants, Orson Pratt, and Rigdon, had their peculiar ideas about angels and other spiritual beings; but Young soon silenced them. When Mr. Dixon asked the President his opinion on these matters, he said impatiently, "We know nothing about it; it may be all true, it may be all false; we have no light as to those things yet." Young knows very well that if speculative opinions are allowed to be brought in, there will very soon be a split in the body. Wisely, therefore, he makes all religion practical, that is, to consist chiefly in regular work in the city and in the farm. "Don't bother yourselves much about your religious duties; you have been chosen for this work, and God will take care of you in it," was a portion of the first sermon he preached to a new batch of emigrants. Accordingly, as far at least as we gather from the book before us, the Book of Mormon has disappeared as the Bible of this people. "King James's Bible," he said to me with emphasis, "is my Bible; I know of none other." But with the Bible in their hands, these Mormons are thus described:—

"These temple builders call themselves saints, accept the Bible as true, baptise their converts in the Name of Christ: but they are not a Christian people, and no Church in the world could hold communion with them in their present state. In truth they approach much nearer both in creed, in morals, and in government, to the rites of Shoshones than to any Anglo-Saxon Church. Young gets a meaning from the Bible

which no one else ever found there. It has been often said that the saints pretend to have a new translation of the Bible; a rendering made by the Holy Spirit: but Brigham Young tells me that this statement is untrue. He claims to understand the Scriptures by a purer light than we Gentiles now possess, and to have a hidden meaning of certain portions of them cleared by Divine revelation; but he takes our Bible as it stands in the authorised English version: . . . . in fact, he seems to regard that version as in some sort divine, and the very language in which it is couched as in some sort sacred."—Pp. 216, 217.

He does not, therefore, want a new Bible, like the Book of Mormon; by his "purer light" he can make the English Bible mean anything he pleases. After all, he is only doing what all other sects have been doing for the last three hundred years, using the Bible to countenance their own inventions. No doubt his creed is farther removed from the letter of the Scriptures than that of any Dissenting sect, but it is strictly in accordance with the Protestant principle of private judgment, with the right claimed by all Protestants, either individually or collectively, to interpret or misinterpret Scripture as they please; to read it by the light of their own fancies, or of those of others. This is, in fact, the oldest form of heresy; it appeared even in the time of the Apostles; S. Paul warns S. Timothy against all such. Hymenæus and Philetus took a "spiritual" view of the resurrection, and declared that it is already past. The particular form which the heresy of Phygellus and Hermogenes took is not told us, but we may gather from other authors that it was some kind of Gnosticism; and so prevalent and so seductive was it, that S. Paul says "all they which are in Asia be turned away from me." The whole of Mr. Dixon's work ought to prove a most fearful warning to us, that when once the authority of Christ's Church is renounced, there is no safeguard against any kind of heresy. Gnosticism is the inevitable result of the "Bible and Bible only" theory. The Mormon creed is essentially Gnostic: we could give authority from Gnostic sources for almost every statement in the eight Articles, were it necessary; but we shall rather defer this parallel till we consider the other phases of heresy which are found in the older States. We must defer this to a subsequent number.

(To be concluded in our next.)

Art. XVII.—CARDINAL MEZZOFANTI.

The life of Cardinal Mezzofanti is interesting chiefly on account of his wonderful proficiency as a linguist, yet, like that of all other Princes of the Roman Church, it has points of contact with the long history of the Papal line, and through it, with the history of the world at large. In him we shall see the peculiar faculty of acquiring languages developed in the highest degree, and throwing into the shade the attainments and fame of Crichton, Walton, Pocock, Toland, Sir William Jones, Dr. Samuel Lee, Cardinal Wiseman, Elihu Burritt, and Sir John Bowring (not to mention continental philologists), so far as a practical knowledge of tongues and dialects is concerned. Some of the feats which he performed in this line are so extraordinary, that if they were not of yesterday we should treat them as legends, and class them with the stories related of Mahomet and Buddha, the first of whom was promised before the Throne of the Highest, that he should have the knowledge of all languages;* and the second, when ten years old, taught his master Babourenou fifty non-Indian tongues with their respective characters.†

Joseph Gaspar Mezzofanti was born at Bologna in September, 1774, the last year of the pontificate of the amiable Ganganelli, and the first year of the reign of Louis XVI. The following inscription for the apartment in which he was born was written by Vincenzo Mignani:—

> Hic Mezzofantus natus, notissimus orbi,
> Unus qui linguas calluit omnigenas.

Like our own Hebraist, Dr. Samuel Lee, he learned as a boy the trade of a carpenter, and, like him also,‡ devoted his spare moments to acquiring ancient languages. While plying his craft at a bench in the street, he would listen to an old priest teaching Latin and Greek in a school just opposite, and thus, as Archdeacon Hare related to Cardinal Wiseman, he caught up every word explained by the master, without ever having seen a Latin or Greek book. By the advice of a kind priest of the Oratory, named Respighi, he was removed at an early age from an elementary school to one of the *Scuole Pie*, conducted by a religious congregation. The Jesuits, it will be remembered, had recently been suppressed by Pope Clement

* Prideaux, *Life of Mahomet*, p. 66.
† Huc, *Chinese Empire*, ii. 187-8.
‡ Jerdan, *Portrait Gallery*, vol. v., art. Dr. S. Lee.

XIV. (Ganganelli), and several of the Order, driven from the Roman, Spanish, and Spanish-American provinces, assisted in the *Scuole Pie.* By this means Father Aponte, a Spaniard, Father Escobar, a native of Guatemala, and Father Thiulen, a Swedish convert, who had, as Dr. Russell informs us, been "*born a Lutheran,*" became Mezzofanti's instructors, and were filled with wonder and delight at his aptitude for study. His memory was prodigious even then. A folio volume of S. John Chrysostom on the Priesthood being one day placed in his hands, he read a page of it once in the original Greek, and then, closing the volume, repeated the entire page without a single mistake! * Such anecdotes respecting a boy are perhaps without parallel, but they remind one of the Jesuit De Rossi,† who, when a line was chosen at pleasure from Dante, Tasso, Petrarch, or Ariosto, would immediately repeat the hundred lines preceding or following it, without any effort or previous preparation.‡ If Mezzofanti's powers were such while he was yet a schoolboy, it is not surprising that he could, when a priest, learn the language of two foreigners condemned to death, in order that he might *the next morning* hear their confessions before they went to execution.§ Mezzofanti himself believed that the Almighty gave him special assistance in accomplishing this task of mercy. He was probably in his twelfth year when he entered the archiepiscopal seminary at Bologna. His inclination towards the priesthood was strong, and the more so perhaps because his mother encouraged it, and his father opposed it. Nothing strengthens our desires so much as a certain amount of opposition. Before he was nineteen, Mezzofanti had, in addition to his theology, become acquainted with Hebrew, Arabic, and Coptic. Every foreigner with whom he came in contact was made to contribute to his stores of learning. A French refugee, driven from his country by the Constituent Assembly of 1792, taught him French. Father Thiulen instructed him in German, and a boy named Uttini, having arrived at Bologna from Stockholm, and being unable to speak a word of Italian, Mezzofanti borrowed his Swedish books, and was able to converse with him freely in that language within a few days." ||

At the age of twenty-three, Mezzofanti was ordained priest, and appointed professor of Arabic in the University of

* Manavit, *Esquisse Historique sur le Cardinal Mezzofanti*, p. 15.
† Born 1740; died 1824.
‡ Anecdote related by Cardinal Wiseman.
§ Headley, *Letters from Italy*, pp. 152, 153.
|| Santagata, *De Josepho Mezzofantio*, p. 185.

Bologna. But he did not long enjoy this honourable post. The Treaty of Tolentino, indeed, in 1797, had ceded the Legation of Bologna to the Cisalpine Republic; but thinking this a forced renunciation on the part of the Sovereign Pontiff, Mezzofanti refused to take the oaths of allegiance to the new Government, or even to present himself, as a compromise in the case of the oath not being enforced, in the salons of the governor. He thus, with two other professors, reduced himself to poverty for conscience' sake. His father was unable to work, his mother was blind and in failing health, his sister's family was poor and scantily fed, and Mezzofanti, with the £25 attached to his professorship, £8 accruing from two small benefices, and about the same sum allowed him by a good priest, Anthony Magnani, had hitherto assisted his parents and kinsfolk with what scarcely sufficed for himself. But his firmness was proof against the temptations of penury, and with less than £20 a year, he made his way, in 1799, amid shots and shells fast falling into the city, to his sister's home, and insisted that she and her children should remove to his house which was less exposed to danger. Strong in himself and in Providence, he toiled, as genius is so often wont to do, in the drudgery of giving lessons. All the noblest families of Bologna were indebted to his learning, while he went from house to house teaching the elements of ancient and modern languages. In the palazzo of the Marescalchi he happily found a good library, and was treated by them as a friend. War and foreign occupation was to him fruitful with numerous advantages. During four years* the city was by turns in the hands of French and Austrians, and in the army of the latter were many officers who had spoken from infancy Teutonic, Slavonic, Czechish, Magyar, and Roumanic dialects. Scarcely a city in Europe, with the exception of Rome, could have afforded so many facilities for Mezzofanti's favourite pursuit. It was never followed by him with selfish ardour. Every record which remains of him tells of his constant benevolence, his devotion to the sick, the prisoners, and the poor. Even the flowery paths of literature were less dear to him than the luxury of doing good. It was in visiting the hospitals especially, and in confessing the wounded or dying soldiers, that he acquired singular proficiency in the languages and *patois* just alluded to.† The Gipsy dialects, Russian and Flemish, were about this time added to the stores of his mind, and it was edifying to observe how constantly he ascribed to the goodness

* A.D. 1796 to 1800. † Manavit, pp. 104, 105.

and grace of God "the iron tenacity of his memory" and "the incredible flexibility of his organ of speech." He never would accept remuneration for serving merchants, bankers, or others who needed translations of foreign letters; he was very abstemious, never indulged in fire, and hardly ever, even when a cardinal, used a *scaldino*. He slept but three hours, studied, taught, or attended the sick during the rest of the twenty-four hours, was appointed foreigners' confessor, and often out of the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, or the Ten Commandments in an unknown tongue constructed the entire fabric of its grammar and great part of its vocabulary, as a naturalist from a single bone can sometimes reconstruct an entire animal of an extinct species.

In the year 1803, fickle Fortune smiled again on the young linguist. He was appointed assistant librarian to the famous Institute of Bologna, and restored to his place as professor of Oriental languages. He formed a close friendship with the Abate de Rossi of Parma, whose life was spent in Oriental literature, and he received an earnest invitation to Paris, where he was promised the same patronage and distinction from the Emperor Napoleon as his fellow-countryman Volta was at that moment enjoying. But the quiet of Bologna pleased him best. "I feel," he said, "that the shade suits me. If I went to Paris, I should be obliged to set myself on a candlestick, where I should emit a faint and flickering lustre that would soon die away."* He loved his native city and had scarcely ever quitted its walls. To his sister's children he was a father, and the education of them all, seven in number, depended on him. Children were his natural delight—his "living poetry." He joined in their sports, wrote odes and sonnets for their *fêtes*, and once composed a comedy to be acted by his little nephews and nieces.† Seldom was more sweet simplicity of character combined with profound learning and striking ability. In the *Catalogue Raisonné* of the Bolognese Institute, Mezzofanti took an important part, and close application to it greatly increased his knowledge of bibliography. It was completed in 1807, and the Oriental MSS. being left entirely to Mezzofanti to classify and describe, he acquired a familiarity with the whole range of Eastern literature. Oriental scholars and travellers who visited Bologna were amazed to discover the mastery which he had gained over the many and complex languages of

* Letter of September 16, 1806.

† Dr. Russell's *Life of Cardinal Mezzofanti*, pp. 184, 185.

the East, and confessed, like the Queen of Sheba in her report of Solomon, that his wisdom exceeded all that they had heard of it in their own country. Again, in November, 1808, the pressure of Napoleon's despotism was felt by Mezzofanti. His sentiments with regard to the Holy See were well known, and Bonaparte could brook no opposition, even though it were inactive. He displaced the unoffending professor, because it was his will to imprison the Pope in his own palace and supersede his authority at Rome. A pension, indeed, was bestowed on Mezzofanti, for all men respected him, but his professorship was suppressed. His time therefore being more at his own disposal, he gave himself to the study of Sanscrit and other Indian tongues, to whose importance Frederic Schlegel had recently awakened attention.*

Jews and sceptics, liberals and ultramontanes, were equally amazed at Mezzofanti's accomplishments. Pietro Giordani, who after having entered the Benedictine congregation, threw himself into the embrace of the revolutionary party in Italy, speaks of him as "a man not only of the utmost piety, but of attainments truly wonderful, and all but beyond belief. . . . . Such is his excessive modesty, that he lives in obscurity, and I must add, to the disgrace of the age, in poverty." "You know Mezzofanti," he says, writing to a friend, "Mezzofanti, the rarest, most unheard-of, most inconceivable of all living men. I call him, and he is, the man of all nations and all ages. He appears as though he had been born in the beginning of the world, and, like S. Anthony, had lived in every age and in every country."† A professor of Turin, named Bucheron, who had thought scorn of Mezzofanti's latinity, plied him one day with a multitude of questions on obscure and difficult passages. On being asked about the result of his interview with the great scholar, he replied, *Per Bacco! è il Diavolo!*

When Napoleon in 1814 was stricken by adverse fortune, and Paris had capitulated to the Allies, Pius VII. was finally released from his bonds, and sent to take possession anew of his pontifical throne. On his way he received the homage of his most worthy and faithful servant, the Abate Mezzofanti. Few men in those trying times had given stronger proofs of fidelity to the Holy See, and it was therefore with twofold propriety that the Pope invited him to proceed to Rome and accept the secretaryship of the Propaganda—a *posta Cardi-*

* *Traité sur la langue et la sagesse des Indiens.* 1808.

† Letter to Count Cicognara, Jan. 30, 1812. Opere di Giordani, ii. 231.

nalizia leading generally to a Cardinal's hat. But this alluring offer only brought Mezzofanti's modesty into clearer light. He declined the invitation to Rome, and Roman honours, as he had declined Imperial favours in Paris. He asked only to be restored to a Professorship of Oriental languages in his native city, where he might still watch over the lives and fortunes of his nephews and nieces, who were to him as his own children. In the following year he became librarian of the University of Bologna, and the salary attached to this office, though small, together with that of his professorship, raised him at length above the pressure of pecuniary cares. For many years he had not been free from the drudgery of tuition, but had endured it cheerfully to support no less than ten individuals.

Mezzofanti was *the* lion of Bologna. No illustrious foreigner thought of visiting the place without seeing him. Mr. Harfold of Blaise Castle, the author of a Life of Michael Angelo, met him in 1817, and again in 1846. It would be little to say that he found him thoroughly versed in English; he was familiar also with our provincial dialects, with the lingo of Yorkshire and *Zummersetshire*, though he had never wandered above thirty miles from Bologna. He spoke Welsh; he detected at once the Canton dialect in a Chinese; Germans could not distinguish him from a German,* and he might have passed for a Greek or a Turk in the dominions of the Grand Seignior.† "He ought to have existed at the time of the Tower of Babel as universal interpreter," wrote Lord Byron. "He is indeed a marvel—unassuming also. I tried him in all the tongues in which I knew a single oath, or adjuration to the gods, against post-boys, savages, Tartars, boatmen, sailors, pilots, gondoliers, muleteers, camel-drivers, vetturini, post-masters, post-houses, post everything; and egad! he astounded me—even to my English." The Emperor Francis I. of Austria, being in Bologna in 1819, appointed an interview with the Abate, and caused some representative of each of the chief languages of the Empire to be present during the audience. Each of them took occasion to address him, but whether in German, Magyar, Bohemian, Wallachian, Illyrian, or Polish, Mezzofanti replied with perfect correctness and fluency.‡

The writer of this article was one day present during a function in S. Peter's at Rome when Mezzofanti was one of

* Stewart Rose, *Letters from the North of Italy*, vol. ii. 54.
† Ibid.
‡ Santagata, Sermones Duo, pp. 19, 20. Dr. Russell, p. 231.

the Cardinals assisting at the Papal throne. A Spanish priest at my side told me that he had just before been presented to the Cardinal, and having addressed him in French, Mezzofanti replied: "I perceive by your accent that you are a Spaniard, let us speak Spanish." A Pole, likewise, who had recently been in company with his Eminence, assured me that he knew six Slavonic languages, and that Mezzofanti had conversed with him in each of them as well as if he had been a native, notwithstanding their extreme difficulty.

A few poems recited on public occasions, and a panegyric on his early friend and tutor Aponte, are all that remain in print of Mezzofanti's compositions. They are not remarkable in themselves, being written in the simplest and roughest style. They look like exercises, and those in Greek, Latin, English, Italian, and French, would certainly fail of obtaining a prize in any of our Universities. It would be nothing more than ordinary in such efforts that they should abound in commonplaces, but they are also wanting in flexibility, taste, and national idiom. *Non omnes possumus omnia.* Mezzofanti's marvels were not of the pen. The method which he found so successful in acquiring languages was that of studying in each its rhythmical structure, and the principle that governs its inflexions. He found in each "a dominant principle regulating the changes of letters according to the different organs of speech," and a constant regard to this leading feature carried him through a crowd of difficulties.* It is easy to conceive how this habit tended to make him a ready speaker rather than a correct writer in foreign tongues. Lady Morgan, in her "Italy,"† says he spoke English with scarcely any accent; and M. Molbeck, a great authority in Danish philology, declares that he conversed in that language with "almost entire correctness, though, from want of exercise, not with the same fluency and ease as in English and German."

In 1820 Mezzofanti began to feel the effects of studies too closely and ardently pursued. His eyesight became weak, and a total suspension of his lectures and reading was absolutely prescribed. But his mind was too active to lie fallow, and in an excursion to Mantua, Modena, Pisa, and Leghorn, he frequented the synagogues to learn modern Hebrew Psalmody, and the accentuation now in use among Italian Jews. At Leghorn he gathered the pronunciation of Romaic from Greek sailors in the port, and in six months was able to resume his

* See his Panegyric on Emanuel Aponte, 1819.
† Vol. i. p. 200.

duties in the University of Bologna. A notice respecting him by the Hungarian astronomer Baron von Zach, in the *Correspondance Astronomique*,* spread his fame far and wide, since it established his marvellous proficiency in Latin-Wallachian, and in the Gipsy dialect, which was then supposed to be a corruption of the language of some tribes of Hindoo parias. He had learned the latter from a gipsy in a Bohemian regiment, and thus his gipsy vocabulary was the purest known, being far superior to that of the gipsies in Spain.† Little-minded cavillers there were who, from time to time, sought to detract from Mezzofanti's reputation, but all men of sound learning and generous minds who came in contact with him, are unanimous in the witness they bear to his extraordinary gift.

Many eminent scholars owed their preferments to the instruction they received from Mezzofanti. To him they came from all parts as to a pure and perennial fountain of Oriental lore. To him Ippolito Rosellini was indebted for the profound knowledge of Hebrew which appeared in his writings,‡ and threw a biblical charm over the lectures delivered by him season after season in the University of Pisa on Egyptian antiquities. There was scarcely a limit to the languages he taught. Mr. Francis Hare, brother of Archdeacon Hare, learnt Italian of him; Lady Granville, then residing with her aunt the Countess Marescalchi, received her first lessons in English from him, and a Franciscan missionary acquired Turkish under his tuition. The Duchess of Devonshire secured his assistance in illustrating her edition of the Æneid, and the veteran *littérateur*, Frederic Jacobs of Gotha, visiting him in 1825, drew attention to the sharp line which he drew between cognate languages, passing from one to the other in conversation without any confusion.

Pius VII. had more than once repeated to Mezzofanti his invitation to Rome and the Propaganda. His successor Leo XII.§ was no less favourable to the Abate, and in 1824 he appointed him member of the College of *Consultori* at Bologna. But it was Gregory XVI. only who was able at last to withdraw the simple-minded professor from his beloved and native city. This last pope was a monk of the Camaldolese order, and well versed in Oriental literature. As Prefect of the Propaganda he corresponded with Mezzofanti, and on one

* Vol. iv. 191, 192; v. 160, 163.
† See Borrow's *Gipsies in Spain*, p. 240.
‡ *Fionda di David*, Bologna, 1823. *Proverbi di Salomone*, 1823.
§ Annibale della Genga, elected 1823.

occasion forwarded an Eastern MS. to him with a view to obtaining a solution of some of its difficulties. The Abate soon returned, explained and translated it entirely into Latin. But on receiving from the Cardinal prefect 100 doubloons for this service, the Abate, poor as he was, sent back the draft, requesting that the sum might be applied to the Propaganda missions. It is wonderful that Rome, which sooner or later attracts to itself all that is greatest and best, did not allure Mezzofanti at an earlier period into its sacred precincts.

Among the princes who visited him at Bologna may be mentioned the Crown Prince of Prussia, in 1828, and the Crown Prince of Sweden. The latter conversed with him in Swedish, but went off into a dialect of Sweden unknown to the Abate. In a subsequent interview, however, he addressed the Prince in that dialect, and was asked with great astonishment of whom he had learnt it.

"From your Royal Highness," replied the Abate. "Your conversation yesterday supplied me with a key to all that is peculiar in its forms, and I am merely translating the common words into this form."*

Lady Blessington has left a charming account of her first encounter with Mezzofanti in the Church of S. Petronius at Bologna,† and there is on record an amusing story of a party of Irish ecclesiastical students, who, meeting him in the library of that city, were fairly beaten by him in what was supposed to be their own language. He could speak Irish; they could not. A Marseillaise lady was delighted to find that he spoke the Provençal dialect with the grace and propriety of a native of Provence; and the historian of the mathematical sciences in Italy, M. Libri, has recorded his indulgence towards the long words of the North American Indians. We are often reminded of these in Longfellow's *Hiawatha*, where we read, for example, of *Pukwndjindinees* (pigmies), *waymukkwana* (a caterpillar), and *pahpukkeena* (a grasshopper); but these are short compared with *wutappesittukquissunnuhwehtunkquoh* (kneeling), in Massachusetts Indian, and *notlazomanitzteopitzkatatzins* in Mexican. Mezzofanti excusing the length of these words, showed M. Libri how the Indians could, in his view, pronounce them with little trouble.‡

In 1830 a general but short-lived revolution broke out in Italy. It was the *contrecoup* of the revolution in France,

* Dr. Russell, p. 272. † *Idler in Italy* iii. 321.
‡ See Du Porceau on the *Grammar of the Indian Languages*, p. 143.

ut was suppressed in the following year by Austrian bayonets. Mezzofanti was one of those deputed by Bologna to offer its omage to the new Pontiff, Gregory XVI. He was immeiately named domestic prelate and protonotary apostolic. The Pope laid siege to him, and at last succeeded in withrawing him from Bologna to Rome. His first visit to the Propaganda was an extraordinary scene. To see a simple, naffected Abate conversing with perfect ease with students rom all quarters of the globe in the native dialect of each, vas a sight equally new and wonderful, and centuries may oll by before it will occur again.*

In October, 1831, Mezzofanti had quitted Bologna, and vas lodged in the Quirinal Palace, nearly opposite the Church f S. Andrew. Ambition was even laid to his charge by letractors at Bologna, who were unable to comprehend the igh and laudable motives by which he was actuated, and vould not see how it is the duty of a good Catholic to obey he wishes of the sovereign pontiff whenever it is possible.

Immediately on Mezzofanti's arrival in Rome he was ppointed Canon of Santa Maria Maggiore. This was but n instalment of the honours which awaited him. The post f librarian of the Vatican was designed for him, but before e could enter on its duties, he visited the Chinese College at Naples, founded by Father Ripa in 1825.† Its object was to repare as priests and catechists natives of China, Cochin China, Peru, Tonquin, and the Indian Peninsula. Here Mezzofanti fell ill of a violent fever in March, 1832. His ife was in danger, and the effect of his delirium was, as he imself told Cardinal Wiseman, to suspend his memory ltogether. He completely forgot all his languages for a time, nd it was not till the summer was past that he recovered his ealth and energy, and availed himself of the linguistic esources in which Rome abounds above all other cities. There he frequented the Maronite convent to speak ancient nd modern Syriac; the Mechitarist communities for Armeian, Persian, and Turkish; the Rutherian presbytery for Sclavonic languages; and there he found Padre Aucher, who ramed with Lord Byron an English Armenian grammar; the Persian scholar Sebastiani; Drach, a learned Hebrew convert; nd Georgio Alabada, an Egyptian skilled in ancient Coptic nd the Arabic dialect of modern Egypt. Almost every day e spent an hour or an hour and a half in the Propaganda, and

* Appendix to *The Jew of Verona*, by Father Bresciani.
† See his *Memoirs*. Murray's Home and Colonial Library.

acted in turn as pupil and master. His good nature charmed all who met him, and endless attempts were made to *pose* him in one or other of the languages spoken by the students of the great Urban College. In 1837 they were 114 in number, and represented 41 distinct nationalities. But every effort made to surprise Mezzofanti into committing a blunder, brought into play more fully his accurate and varied attainments. Gradually he rose to the eminent station for which nature had designed him, and in May, 1833, he was installed as First Keeper of the Vatican Library, in the place of Cardinal, then Monsignor, Mai. With this office was combined a canonry of S. Peter's.

It may be as well to mention that Mezzofanti's knowledge of Welsh and power of conversing in it rest on the testimony of many travellers, such as Dr. Forster, an English physician, Dr. Baines, one of the English Vicars Apostolic, Dr. Edwards of Paris, Mr. Rhys Powel, and Dr. Russell, the President of Maynooth. Monsignor Malou, of Bruges, Monsignor Aerts, and Cardinal Sterckx, of Malines, frequently talked with him in Flemish, while the Fathers Van Calven and Legrelle, M. Leon Wilde, and Dr. Wap bear witness to the extent and accuracy of his Dutch. The Bohemian poet Frankl conversed with him alternately in Bohemian and Hebrew; Father Schembri and Canon Falzon, both Maltese, found Mezzofanti quite at his ease in speaking their dialect, though it can hardly be said to possess a literature, and is compounded of Italian, Greek, and Arabic. The testimony of these writers is scattered over a number of works cited by Dr. Russell,* and to them may be added that of the Marquis de Lavradio, Portuguese Ambassador at Rome, and his brother the Count de Lavradio. They were struck by the precision of his Portuguese, and his "complete mastery over the delicate forms of conversational phraseology." No wonder that Dr. Wap of Breda wrote of him that "his intellect penetrated the language-secret of all nations;" † that Frankl, presenting him with a copy of his *Colombo*, wrote in it—"To Mezzofanti, the Chameleon of language;" and that Gregory XVI. called him "A living Pentecost."

Extensive knowledge could not but be coupled with liberal ideas. He was no advocate of retrograde movement. He had no sympathy with those friends of darkness and ruins, who haunt the ancient church like bats and moles rather than

* *Life of Mezzofanti*, chap. xi.
† From lines written in Dutch in Mezzofanti's Album.

living choristers. If he saw much that is grand in medieval Christianity, he saw also much that is faulty. He believed that society, like individuals, may go on unto perfection, and that progress is a divine law. He read a paper in the Academia at Rome which attracted much attention, and was entitled, "The Services of the Church in diffusing true knowledge and developing the human mind." He was himself a signal instance of the Church's power. Nature and Religion made him what he was. Secular knowledge and divine met in him, united as a bride and bridegroom at the altar. At the Vatican he was always welcome, and the most learned men from all parts of the world coveted and sought his society. He delighted in dividing himself between them, and they in return admired him as a miracle of learning, who not only spoke with each of them in his own tongue, but evinced the closest intimacy with the literature, the customs, the traditions, and often the *personel* and the very slang of their own country. He seemed to have been always travelling though he was very stationary, and always observing mankind though he was deep in books. A more brightly-winged bookworm never shot across a flowery mead. His Scriptural and Rabbinical Hebrew was marvellous—it was that of a Rabbi in Solomon's porch. Poles could not believe but that he had resided and studied in their afflicted fatherland. Lord Byron learned his modern Greek partly from Mezzofanti;* and before Cardinal Wiseman left Rome, he allowed himself that he could speak fifty languages. "Fifty and Bolognese," these were his words. It was the number he specified in his Dutch verses addressed to Dr. Wap; *mijne tong verbleef med viftig taalen stom.*

There was scarcely a Greek author, sacred or profane, whom he had not read; and he quoted from memory the more beautiful passages in the orators and tragedians of ancient Greece. He learned Californian from two Indian natives, and then *taught them* the grammar of their own unwritten tongue. The structure of the Indian languages is very peculiar, and it is therefore the more remarkable that Mezzofanti made himself complete master of the Algonquin, which is the parent of a progeny of dialects. Being already well acquainted with Arabic and the languages of the East derived from Sanscrit, he applied himself to Chinese in his sixtieth year. Even to him it was difficult, and demanded four months of continuous study. But his success was signal, though he could not acquire it by his usual method, through the ear, but was

* Appendix to Notes to Child Harold, canto ii.

obliged to fix his attention on the eye-language, which, in the case of Chinese, is distinct from that of the ear.*

In a consistory held on the 12th of February, 1838, Mezzofanti was "preconized" Cardinal priest of the title of S. Onuphrius. He thus became one of the *Presbyteri Cardinales*, who represent the principal churches of Rome in which baptism was administered in ancient days. The College of Cardinals forms the Pope's council in the affairs of the Church, being at once deliberative and executive. A general meeting of this body is called a Consistory, but their labour is distributed among "Congregations" or committees, each having its own department. There are nearly twenty of these Congregations, some composed of Cardinals only, and others consisting of Cardinals, or a Cardinal, and Prelates. The presiding Cardinal in a Congregation is called a Prefect; and in the appointments, regard is had to the respective qualifications of the Cardinals. Mezzofanti, in consideration of his learning, was named—

1. Prefect of the Congregation for the correction of the Liturgical Books of the Oriental Church.
2. Prefect of the Congregation of Studies.
3. Member of the Congregation of the Propaganda.
4. Member of the Congregation of the Chinese Mission.
5. Member of the Congregations of the Index, of Rites, and of the Examination of Bishops.

In addition to these offices Mezzofanti filled that of President of the Hospital of San Salvatore, and Visitor of the House of Catechumens, destined chiefly for converted Jews and Mahometans. The revenue he enjoyed out of the Civil List was 4,000 scudi (about £850), and though this sum is usually absorbed in a Cardinal's necessary expenses, he contrived nevertheless to be very charitable. He resided in the Palazzo Valentiniani with a nephew and an unmarried niece. Fifty-three students of the Propaganda waited on him with congratulations on his assuming the purple, and he replied to them in the fifty-three languages which they respectively represented. His habits remained little altered. His table was as simple, his hours were as early, his visits to the hospitals as constant, and his study of fresh languages as unabated, as when he lived in comparative retirement in Bologna. Araminna, a language of Africa, and the "impossible" Basque,† were added to his store in his declining years.

* Dr. Russell's *Life*, p. 369.

† Manuel de Larramendi entitles his book on the Basque Grammar (Salamanca, 1729), *Impossible vencido*, "The Impossible overcome."

Dr. Russell, who knew him intimately, has recorded many ırticulars of his acquaintance with English history and erature, of his reading and enjoying "Hudibras," and of the terest which he took in the religious movement at Oxford, e Hampden Controversy, the "Tracts for the Times," the British Critic" and No. 90. The predictions which he ıtered in 1841 in reference to this great movement have been lfilled, and are still receiving their fulfilment. The spirit of leration and forbearance with which he regarded the defec- ve faith, or misbelief, of others, was truly Christian, and ıtter calculated than any theological bitterness to bring ıvillers and sceptics to the truth.

The scene presented every Epiphany at the College of the ropaganda is one of the most curious and interesting in the orld. The students are arranged in rows rising one above ıother in the order in which they are to take part in the ıercises of the day, and all of these refer to the manifestation Christ to the Gentiles. Almost every tribe and race under ıe sun is there represented. "The classic Indian, the stately rmenian, the calm and impassive Chaldee, the solemn Syrian, ıe fiery Arab, the crafty Egyptian, the swarthy Abyssinian, ıe stunted Birman, the stolid Chinese," each betrays through ıe veil of national peculiarity the interest he feels in the ılemn occasion.* The audience is seated below the platform. he Cardinals occupy the front seats, and among them, before ıe year 1848, no one attracted more attention than Cardinal Iezzofanti. Some of the exercises are dialogues, some are les, some thèmes in prose.† The youths and men who ıcited, in Mezzofanti's time, turned often toward the place here he sat, as if sure of his understanding their words and ıarking their emphases, however they might be lost on the ıass of the hearers. When the assembly broke up, a motley rowd gathered round him, and his power of flying from ınguage to language displayed itself to the greatest advantage. eguan, Russian, Chinese, and a dozen other tongues were poken by him on such occasions with amazingly rapid transi- ons, and he seemed to individualise each voice when several poke at the same moment in different dialects. It was like bird flitting from spray to spray. It was like Harwitz play- ıg three games of chess at the same time without seeing one f the boards; Walter Scott dictating fluently his "Life of Napoleon" while in act of consulting and comparing authori-

* Dr. Russell's *Life*, p. 418.

† See *Academia Poliglotta del Collegio Urbano de Propagandâ Fede*, ıublished yearly.

ties; Lord Peterborough dictating to six or seven secretaries simultaneously, and Julius Cæsar listening, reading, writing, and dictating (as Pliny says he did) all at the same time. Whatever language he spoke, Mezzofanti's course was direct. He steered right ahead, sometimes slowly and at others swiftly, just as the wind filled his sails, but always avoiding the shoals and quicksands of cognate dialects and near resemblances. His discrimination was unique, and with this faculty was closely connected that of dividing his attention between different objects. That his knowledge was practical rather than speculative, may easily be admitted. The range it took was too wide to allow of its being also deep, and several scholars who visited him had occasion to regret his want of skill in the science of language and its bearing on ethnology. The Chevalier Bunsen maintains, and not without some reason, that though he was a giant as a linguist, he was a child as a philologist and critic. He lived on recollections, and had not an original thought. His verses were almost puerile, and he has embodied no remarkable ideas in prose. His *forte* was prodigious memory. Such was the account given by M. Bunsen;* and though the Abbé Gaume and Dr. Russell entertain a higher opinion of his philology, it cannot be denied that his greatness was confined to one sphere, and that his mind was not eminently philosophical, that he was no divine in the usual sense of the word, no biblical critic of a high order, and was endowed with few literary gifts.

The Emperor Nicholas must not be forgotten as a witness to Mezzofanti's success as a linguist. When he visited Rome in 1845, and was rebuked by Gregory XVI. for his cruelty to the Catholic subjects of his empire,† Mezzofanti waited upon him by express invitation, and astonished him by speaking Russian and Polish without any trace of foreign peculiarity. The Cardinal, indeed, did not enter on the momentous topic of the Czar's persecutions. He prudently left this matter in higher hands, though his sympathies with the suffering Catholics in Poland and Lithuania had long been excited to the utmost by the accounts of their tortures and trials, which he heard from the lips of Makrena Mirazylawski, abbess of the Basilian convent of Minsk.‡

Pope Gregory XVI. died on the 1st of June, 1846, and the Cardinals in conclave, Mezzofanti included, speedily elected

* See his Notes communicated to Dr. Russell. *Life of Mezzofanti*, pp. 438, 439.

† Wiseman's *Last Four Popes*, p. 409 *et seq.*

‡ See *Household Words*, May 13, 1854.

his successor. The great linguist composed an epigram on the occasion, which was graceful enough:

> Gregorius cœlo invectus sic protinus orat:
> "Heu cito Pastorem, da, bone Christe, gregi!"
> Audit; et immissus pervadit pectora Patrum
> Spiritus: et Nonus prodidit ecce Pius!

Keeping aloof, as the Cardinal did, from political strife, it must have been peculiarly grievous to him to witness the rapid progress of revolution in the city where study and piety should always prevail. The concessions of the new Pontiff in a liberal direction were followed by extreme demands of the clubs, the expulsion of the Jesuits, the barbarous assassination of the minister De Rossi,* the republican ministry being forced on a protesting sovereign, the Pope's flight, and the proclamation of a Republic. Mezzofanti, now old and infirm, was urged to follow his master to Gaeta, but he refused to leave Rome, and remained unmolested in the Palazzo Valentiniani.

In February, 1849, it became evident that his time was short. Gastric fever had succeeded to pleurisy, and he himself fixed the time for receiving the Viaticum and Extreme Unction. In the accounts given of his death, as in the case of most pious Roman Catholics, we see how little the thoughts of purgatory really occupies the mind. The soul, relying on the perfect sacrifice and infinite merits of its divine Redeemer, looks forward with confident hope to a speedy admission into the joys of heaven, though the dying man would admit in the abstract the possibility of some temporary suffering beyond the grave. *Andiamo, andiamo, presto in Paradiso,* were the last words Mezzofanti was heard to utter.

Thus, on the 15th of March, 1849, he passed away, admired, beloved, wondered at. Even the new-born Republic would have done him honour. A public funeral was offered † with an escort of the National Guard, but these tokens of respect were declined because they came from an unlawful government. In one thing he was unique, *viz.* in the number of languages which he spoke and read, though, of course, not all equally well. So far as records exist, no man has equalled him in these acquisitions. Mithridates and Pico of Mirandola are said to have known twenty-two languages, while the knowledge of twenty-eight is ascribed to Jonadab Alhanar and Sir William Jones. Müller, Niebuhr, Fresnel, and Sir John Bowring are credited to the number of twenty. Professor Lee

* Nov. 15, 1848.
† By Sig. Gherardi, Minister of Public Instruction.

is said to have mastered sixteen. But the undoubted achievements of Mezzofanti greatly surpass all that is stated of past linguists, even after years and ages have had full scope for the usual exaggerations. His nephew Minarelli, who had access to all his papers, books, paradigms, critical analyses, and memoranda, has made a list of the languages he had learned, and other friends have classified these according to the several degrees in which, so far as they could ascertain, the Cardinal was conversant with them. They numbered one hundred and fourteen.

"Let it never be forgotten," they are the words not of a Roman Catholic, but of a Lutheran friend, "that he was a charitable, kind Christian, devout but not intolerant, and that his habitul meekness was not a cloak, but a real Christian habit and virtue. Honour be to his memory."*

* M. Bunsen to the Rev. Dr. Russell, President of Maynooth.

CORPORATE RE-UNION FROM AN ORTHODOX POINT OF VIEW.

ART. XVIII. — *L'Union Chrétienne. Revue Orthodoxe.* Paris. 1868.

[COMMUNICATED.]

THAT the Corporate Re-union of the Christian Family is a mere visionary dream, confined to a few eccentric members of the Anglican Communion; or else a delusive theory, invented to meet certain circumstances, pressing upon the convictions of a few discontented spirits, is a very favourite assertion with the rationalistic and ultramontane press; that it is an entirely erroneous one, is sufficiently proved by the drift of the periodical named at the head of this paper. That periodical, which is perused with steadily increasing interest by numerous classes of readers on the Continent, and which displays such deep learning, such comprehensive charity, and truly evangelical moderation on the part of its conductors, is devoted to the advocacy of the same great cause, the furtherance of which is the main object of the publication of the UNION REVIEW. A fact so cheering and encouraging surely calls not only for grateful acknowledgment, but for cordial co-operation and serious reflection on both sides. The principal object of the publication of the *Union Chrétienne* is undoubtedly identical with that of the UNION REVIEW, but the question arises, whether the means proposed for its attainment by the writers in the former serial correspond with those we are accustomed to see developed in these pages. Now, it might with great appearance of truth be argued, that the time for answering this question has not yet arrived; that, although we are in a position to prove that the Corporate Re-union of Christendom is to be looked for, wished for, prayed for, and worked for, yet we are not yet sufficiently advanced to be able to indicate, even in the most general manner, the means whereby it is to be accomplished. At the bottom of this line of argument there lies a very insidious and dangerous error, an error which appears to pervade the entire leaning of religious thought of our day, an error, indeed, which lies at the root of all the division and unbelief we so deeply deplore; this error consists in the substitution of sentiment or "sensation" for principle. It is easy enough to be transported with the grandeur of the "idea" of a Re-united Christendom, to be perfectly enthusiastic in expressing admiration and approval, and yet, directly

we are called upon to act, to make the least sacrifice, to submit to the slightest inconvenience for the sake of realising it, for us to draw back in timid hesitation, find fault with whatever is proposed, and actually to take credit to ourselves for our fancied high appreciation of the desirability of the thing, as evinced by our strenuous assertion of its difficulty.

It is not, however, to those who would thus act that these observations are addressed, they are rather submitted to the serious consideration of those who feel the awful responsibility incurred by all who knowingly acquiesce in that abominable state of division and enmity into which our own sins, and those of our forefathers, have led us. To those who are awake to this responsibility, and who wish to act upon it, no suggestion will be thrown away which appears to point out any probable means of accomplishing the great work. To them therefore such a periodical as the one before us will appear of inestimable value.

Its history alone is highly suggestive and instructive; originally devoted to the advocacy of Gallican principles, it was known, far and wide, as the fearless and consistent opponent of that rabid ultramontanism which has now almost entirely overrun the Continental churches; but the promulgation of the Bull *Ineffabilis*, and the prohibition of the ancient Gallican offices, signalised the final downfal of that school, and the triumph of Papal innovation; thenceforth the position maintained by the *Union Chrétienne* was untenable in the Roman Church; accordingly, it became necessary to take another standing ground, whereon to carry on the struggle for Catholic unity. The Orthodox Church of the East was happily chosen, and thenceforward the voice of the noble Champion of Catholic truth and Catholic unity has been unceasingly heard from the vantage ground afforded by a Church strong in the life-giving principles of true Catholicity. The paper now to be submitted to the readers of the UNION REVIEW occurs in the number for March last, being the third of the New Series.

"The question of the union of Churches has always engaged the attention of the highest classes of thinkers in England. It is certain that, with the Anglican Church, it is a matter of life and death. There can no longer be any doubt respecting the perilous situation in which she is placed, attacked as she is by rationalism on the one hand, and popery on the other; both of which have effected a lodgment on her own ground. In the presence of this twofold danger, the friends of the English Church seek for a means of saving her, and this

means they find in union. But this union presents itself under different aspects. Some aim at an universal union, comprehending the Eastern and Western Churches: amongst these we would mention Dr. Pusey, one of the boasts of the Anglican Church; and Anglo-Romans such as Messrs. Phillipps de Lisle, and Ffoulkes. These latter recognise the authority of the Pope, but they do not desire that this authority should be a despotism; what they desire above all things is, that the Pope, divesting himself of the compromising burden of mediæval traditions, should recur, through the past, to the first Bishops of Rome, and thus open the door to an universal reconciliation. With regard to Dr. Pusey, it seems that his conclusions are not far removed from theirs. We observe especially that he perfectly concurs with the Anglo-Romans, in wishing for a reasonable union, grounded upon the perfect truth, elicited by means of a fraternal and enlightened discussion.

"We cannot forbear from acknowledging how honourable such opinions are to those who entertain them; at the same time, we are constrained to point out, that they are nothing but an illusion of well-intentioned men. In fact, those who entertain them persuade themselves that the Pope and his court will be willing to submit the question to the arbitrament of a charitable and learned discussion. In that persuasion they strangely deceive themselves. The Pope and the Roman Court will NEVER consent thus to decide the question. They will NEVER see anything in the notion of union, but an *absolute submission* to the Papacy. It is labour lost to attempt to inspire them with any other sentiments.

"It is a fact unhappily too certain, that, in the Latin Communion, the divine constitution of the Church is, in our days, so completely vitiated, that there are few in that communion who really understand the principles which constitute its essential elements. With the majority of its clergy and laity, the Church is an absolute monarchy; and the Pope the absolute and infallible sovereign of the Church. He contains it entirely in himself, and possesses in his own single person the source of all truth and all jurisdiction.

"In the face of a theory such as this, generally received as it is in the existing Latin Communion, how can the Pope be asked or expected to cast reflections on the past history of the Institution which he represents; to acknowledge the errors of his predecessors, or those of his own; to revise the doctrines of Rome, to eliminate errors, or to repent of the evils in the Christian community of which the Papacy has been the direct source?

"To all applications of this nature the Pope and his court will always reply as follows:—

"'The Pope is the centre of unity by right Divine; union consists solely in absolute submission to his authority; in the default of such submission lies the essence of schism and heresy.'

"They actually believe themselves to make a great display of gracious condescension, in offering to inquirers certain pretended *proofs* in favour of the papal sovereignty, pitiable proofs after all, consisting only of spurious passages, arbitrarily interpreted.

"And this is all that Rome accords to honourable and learned men, who endeavour to prove themselves stedfast in their advocacy of an universal union, grounded upon truth generally admitted after a learned and charitable discussion. All other Churches might admit that ground, but Rome NEVER will. If, at the Council of Trent, when ultramontanism had not reached the height which it has attained at the present day, she refused to admit the Protestants, save in the character of defendants making their apology, how can men yield to the illusion that now, when all the Latin Bishops profess ultramontanism as a fundamental dogma of their Church, Rome will come to an understanding with other Churches, and consent to avow the wrongs she has inflicted?

"Once more, we say it is an illusion, an illusion indeed which redounds to the honour of those who are led away by it, for it attests that, in their secession to the Roman Church, they expected to find in it that which she promised them, namely, knowledge of Divine truths, love of primitive tradition, and unity; this illusion proves, also, that they adhere to the persuasion which they had acquired, that those supposed benefits, by means of which Rome knows so well how to disguise her despotism, are only temporarily obscured, and that too in consequence of unfortunate circumstances. But Anglo-Romans and Latinizing Anglicans* will wait long. The hour which they look for will never arrive: Rome will remain misguided to the last. She assures herself of victory in the very bosom of defeat, and prides herself all the more in her

* "*Les Anglicans Latins ou Latinisants.*" By the latter expression the writer signifies the extreme Ritualists. It is, if I may be allowed to say so, unfortunately too expressive. I very much fear that too many of those thus alluded to have so far departed from the true and sure road to unity, as to have adopted very many Roman innovations, which will eventually prove a most grievous obstacle to a union on Catholic principles. God grant that the warnings and exhortations which, from time to time, reach them from Orthodox writers, may be heard in time by those earnest and amiable labourers in this great cause!—[*Trans.*]

pretended divine despotism, the more it is rejected by all men with contempt.

"Some Anglicans, struck with the similarity which exists between the constitution of their Church and that of the ancient Gallican Church, believe themselves warranted in thinking, that, by taking Gallicanism for a basis, they can arrive at an understanding with Rome. This again is a strange illusion. Are they not aware that Gallicanism is now-a-days disgraced, spat upon, and condemned as a schism and a disguised heresy? Bossuet himself, who represented the degenerate Gallicanism of the age of Louis XIV.; Bossuet, who endeavoured, during the whole of his life, to bring Rome over to some reasonable notions, by making certain considerable concessions: is not this very Bossuet ridiculed by the entire ultramontane sect? Have not men like Villecourt and Davin gone so far as to throw dirt on the pure life of the great bishop? Is it not considered the correct thing, amongst that sect, to deny the genius and eloquence of the Eagle of Meaux? They even go so far as to deny him the merit of elegance. Recently we read in *Le Monde* an emphatic eulogium of Cardinal Pitra: and, referring to the life of Leger d'Autun, written by that French "ex-Neo-Benedictine," the writer of the critique goes on to say, in praise of the style of the book, 'it was not written under the reign of Bossuet.' The history, forsooth, would have been written badly had it been done *under that reign.* And certain Benedictines of that period named Mabillon, Montfaucon, d'Acheri, and the like, are not to be compared with the Neo-Benedictines Guéranger and Pitra! Have not some dared to say, even at Meaux itself, that the remains of Bossuet ought to be expelled from the cathedral as those of a heretic? ! ! ! If the ultramontanes treat Bossuet thus in France, what will they not venture upon in Rome? A former nuncio at Paris, M. Garibaldi, once spoke to our face of the 'sublime' Bishop of Meaux, with a disdain which we shall never forget. The fat gross nuncio, Garibaldi, who died of a surfeit, to speak with disdain of Bossuet! It is one of those extravagancies which are only to be encountered in the ultramontane sect.

"It is, consequently, quite in vain that Dr. Pusey invokes the great name of Bossuet; it is in vain that the Roman or Romanizing Anglicans prop themselves up with the thought, that Gallicanism can become an intermediary for effecting an intercommunion between Rome and the Anglican Church. For three centuries there were, perhaps, grounds for such an expectation. In our days it is an impossibility.

"Union cannot be realised save in Churches separate from Rome; this is a truth which cannot be contested. The Anglican Church can unite with the Eastern Catholic Church, because the latter will never say to her that she must previously submit to her authority. Let the Anglican Church revise, of herself, certain of her doctrines, upon which continental protestantism has carried her too far; let her recur on these points to the primitive doctrines, as they were set forth by the teachers of the first eight centuries, she will then become herself orthodox, and her union with the Eastern Catholic Church will be an accomplished fact.

"In such an union as this, she will find that doctrinal authority which is wanting to her. It is the default of such authority which estranges from her such a considerable number of her children; who, expecting to find it in Romanism, become the adepts of that false system, and remain in it, for some motive or another, after becoming convinced that a true doctrinal authority does not exist in it. By her union with the Apostolic Church of the East, the true Mother of all other Churches, the Anglican Church will find herself in that magnificent *Catholic Unity*, which consists in nought else than *identity* of life *throughout all ages*. Her voice, united to that of the Eastern Church, which is truly *one*, *Catholic* and *Apostolic*, will become the echo of the apostolic voice, perpetuating itself from age to age, without interruption; her doctrine would no longer be a Christian philosophy, more or less accurately developed, but an *inheritance*, faithfully handed down. Her children could then peacefully enjoy the possession of that heritage, in the midst of all the discussions with which the world is agitated, and those who are bewildered by those discussions would no longer seek, in a blind obedience to the word of a single individual, denominated the Pope, a resting-place for their minds, and a refuge from scepticism.

"If we might venture upon a word of advice, appropriate to what is taking place in England in relation to the union of Churches, we would urge, that all intelligent Englishmen, friends of Christian verity, whether they be Romans or Anglicans, should persevere in their idea of forming amongst themselves a vast association, that they should not address themselves to Rome, where their association will be always anathematised; that they should labour, with one accord, to formulate a doctrine upon which they could unite, taking for a basis, not the decisions of Rome, but the teaching of the primitive British Church.*

* "Eglise *Anglicane* primitive." The relations of the *Anglican* Church,

"By this means they will arrive at the profession of Christian truth; and then it will only remain for them to cast their eyes around them, to recognise which Church has best preserved that primitive doctrine, in order to enter into communion with it.

"Such is the true means of arriving at unity.

"Rome of course seeks to stifle such an association, as facts indeed show. She will heap condemnations upon condemnations upon it. Her emissaries in England are armed with every device to dissolve it, to hinder the publication of its journals, to reduce it to silence. If the association leaves Rome and her emissaries to sound their artificial thunder, without paying the least regard to it; if it continues peaceably to march on in the course which it has chalked out, the results will be excellent, and exceed all expectations which they may now indulge in.

"Rome always calculates upon the terror which she inspires. When she sees that men have no fear of her she maintains a discreet silence."

A few reflections upon the remarkable views so ably enunciated in this extremely interesting paper, may be acceptable at the present juncture. The favourable opinion it expresses of the feasibility and desirability of the union of the Anglican with the Orthodox Church, is worthy of especial notice, but it is one in which those who are acquainted with the actual state of things in the Establishment will, I fear, hesitate to concur. It will be observed, that while the writer holds out the prospect of a union with the Establishment on the part of the Orthodox Church, he evinces something very like distrust of the tendencies of the Ritualists.* It would be futile to ignore the strong Roman sympathies which the Ritualists entertain; still, the real state of the case affords very great excuse for them. The writer indulges in his sanguine appreciation of the union tendencies of the English Church as a whole, because he believes in what does not exist, namely, the possession of any real vitality or true Catholic feeling in the Anglican Church, outside the Ritual party as they are called, which is in truth the only Catholic element in it. As for the Latinizing tendencies of that party, great hopes may be entertained that, when they become aware of the

founded by Augustine, to the British Church, which is, in reality, the *primitive* Church of our country, are not widely understood. It is worthy of remark how deficient the mediæval Anglican Church seems to have been in catechetical literature.

* And this feeling displays itself much more conspicuously in other pages of the Review.

certain truth that these tendencies are likely to create a serious obstacle to the only union which, under present circumstances, is righteous and practicable, they will suppress them, and sacrifice them to the great cause they have so deeply at heart. The reasonableness of this expectation, and the fact that it is based upon the supposition of the consistency of the Ritualists, may be hoped for upon the following grounds:—

Firstly: the acknowledged principles of the party, which carry them beyond everything which is distinctively Roman for their precedents. Dr. Littledale expressly claims nothing more than the restoration of that which existed before the great Latin schism.

Secondly: the practical tendencies of the party, and their devotion, above all things, to the cause of unity; once convince them that any line of conduct is calculated to obstruct its progress, and their avoidance of such conduct may be confidently reckoned upon.

Thirdly: sooner or later the anti-union character of ultramontane principles, and the universal prevalence of those principles throughout the entire Roman Church, will speedily convince them that nothing is to be gained for the union cause by any concession to Rome.

Fourthly: the constraining power of truth is not to be forgotten, the Ritualists deserve credit for the highest ability and learning, genuine candour and zeal, thorough honesty, and last, not least, true humility; no one can deny the possession of these qualifications by Dr. Pusey himself, and he may now be regarded as having cast in his lot with the Ritualists or Catholic party. This being the case, where are we to look for a more promising field for the operation of truth and the success of those principles which will ultimately lead to unity?

It will be observed that the Catholic party is here spoken of as the true hope of the lover of unity, to the express exclusion of the rest of the Establishment; the *Union Chrétienne* speaks differently. These remarks are penned by one who has long and anxiously watched the state of religious parties in England from an Orthodox point of view, and always with the firm hope and expectation of seeing the time arrive when the Orthodox Church, the only representative of Œcumenical Christianity, should fulfil her mission, even in the midst of the distracted West, and should be recognised as the true depository of those Divine truths to which this generation is gradually awakening. The arrival of that time

seems close at hand; it is manifest that the fundamental principles of the Catholic, or, as it is called, the Ritual party, are identical with hers, and grievous indeed would it be if the natural result of that identity should be interfered with by the exaggeration of the importance of any petty aberrations or inconsistencies to which a party circumstanced as it is, is peculiarly subject. God forbid that the least deviation from the *old paths, where is the right way*, should here be represented as unimportant, but the very problem before us is how to ensure a return to those *old paths* of a people who have wandered from them in so many directions. And is it not reasonable to expect that this is best done by encouraging those who show the strongest disposition to ascertain them, and to shape their course accordingly? Such a disposition is shown by the Catholic party, far more evidently than by any others; hence, unity is much more likely to originate with them than with the rest of the Establishment, which is the mere creature of the State. How far the residue may be influenced by the Catholic party, supposing it to be united with the Orthodox Church, is another thing; it may be hoped that it would be influenced extensively, and in the operation of this influence the real work of unity may perhaps be extended over a large proportion of the whole. But all depends upon whether the Catholic party are equal to the occasion, whether they recognise the urgency of the crisis, and whether they are willing to sacrifice some few erratic tendencies, inconsistent with the principles they profess, to that great cause of unity, which, above all other men, they profess to have most at heart.

A Member of the Eastern Church.

RECENT ESSAYS ON THE CHURCH.

ART. XIX.—1. *The Church and the World: Essays on Subjects of the Day in* 1868. By Various Writers. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. London: Longmans, 1868.

2. *Essays on Church Policy.* Edited by the Rev. W. L. CLAY. London: Macmillan, 1868.

THE appearance in as many successive years of three goodly volumes of Essays under Mr. Orby Shipley's able editorship, is itself a significant fact, and its significance becomes more apparent if we contrast the front presented by the Ritualists (*sit venia verbo*) with the present attitude whether of the Broad Church or Evangelical parties in the Church of England. That the Evangelicals would make any show in the literary arena was not of course to be expected. The *Record* and the *Rock* are more than sufficient to exhaust their intellectual energies, and the Church Association gives abundant scope to their capabilities for practical work, or rather for its hindrance. But literature is the speciality of Broad Churchmen. For devotional purposes indeed they are compelled to borrow from their rivals, nor do they profess to have accomplished much in the way of active ministrations among the young, the suffering, and the poor. It is their one claim to attention that they are the real leaders in the world of thought; and some few years ago, when Professor Jowett's influence was in the ascendant at Oxford, the claim was beginning to be tacitly admitted. Dr. Newman and the Tractarians had had their day. No doubt some traces of their teaching might still linger in obscure country parsonages, or among the *ignavum pecus* of Oxford passmen, whose vanity was soothed by the pretext for a pious sneer at theories they were too lazy or too stolid to comprehend. But for a man of intellect to profess Catholic principles, at least in the English Church, was rapidly becoming out of date. The religion of the future, if the future would condescend to retain any, was in the hands of the Liberals. And the seven champions of a regenerated Christendom proceeded to sketch out their programme in the famous *Essays and Reviews.* The book was a strange medley of truth and falsehood, and some of its Scriptural criticisms, fatal as they are to the only supernatural basis of Protestant belief, may very probably turn out to have an important bearing on the vexed questions of Biblical inspiration and interpretation, whenever the time for their adjustment with the claims of Catholic theology

shall arrive. Eight years have passed since then, and three bulky volumes, each containing more than double the number of essays included in the Broad Church manifesto, have appeared from the doomed and discredited Ritualists. These volumes range, as their title indicates, over the widest variety of subjects connected directly or indirectly with the corporate or individual life of the Church. Not only dogma, discipline, devotion, ritual, Ecclesiastical history and music, but philosophical, moral, and artistic matters are also discussed in their bearings on religion; and even so our enumeration remains incomplete. To expect a series of essays on topics so vast and so diverse, from some forty different writers, to be of equal merit throughout would be obviously unreasonable. We have, in reviewing the two former volumes, called attention to some distinctions between them, and we may have occasion to do so again here. But what is remarkable is that there should be so very few we could willingly have spared, and that, even in the judgment of indifferent or unfriendly critics, a large body of writers, most of whom are men absorbed in active work, should be so well able to hold their own. To a fuller appreciation of moral and ascetic, no less than dogmatic knowledge, they have contributed most valuable materials. Meanwhile from the opposite side of the camp, after an eight years' silence, there issues almost contemporaneously with Mr. Shipley's third series a collection of eight *Essays on Church Policy*, edited by Mr. Clay. Both in quantity and quality this answer to the challenge thrown down by the Ritualists is singularly meagre. Seven writers—our Liberal friends have evidently a weakness for the mystic number—two of whom alone are at all known to fame, have combined to write an elaborate supplement to Dr. Stanley's recent Address on the *Connection of Church and State*. For that is really the one subject of the volume. We need hardly say that this REVIEW has always been favourable to the principle of Church Establishments, and that, when circumstances are propitious, we recognise many practical advantages in its adoption—especially, in this country, with a view to re-union—nor are we at all prepared to say that the time has come for sacrificing them. But when the union of Church and State is advocated, as it is by these Essayists, not as a national homage to the truth, but as the only available means for the nation to emancipate its clergy from the trammels of dogmatic truth altogether, and turn them into a kind of moral police for the promotion of improved drainage and cultivated deism, we are constrained to

observe that the principle is radically false, and the practice absolutely intolerable. The Church, according to Mr. Berkeley, is simply "an organization of the State for the ends of religion." The national legislature is the proper court for determining, "not whether a dogma is true, but whether it is a truth of which the conscience of men generally is convinced." And the recent vote of St. Botolph's vestry (Mr. Rogers's church, of "theology be hanged" notoriety) against the Athanasian Creed was "an admirable precedent" for Parliament to follow. Of course, the sooner an Established Church—or rather "an established chaos"—of this kind is disestablished the better. But we are referring to Mr. Clay's volume here chiefly in illustration of the conspicuous failure of the Broad Church school to meet their antagonists on the domain which might seem peculiarly their own. Instead of attempting to grapple with any of the doctrinal, moral, or devotional wants of the day—instead of even competing with the Catholic school on such common ground as the existing state of the marriage law, or of immoral literature, or the terrible prevalence of infanticide—they confine themselves to a barren protest in favour of "clerical liberty of thought and speech," and of a State Church as the best security for maintaining it. In short, they have only expanded more gracefully and at greater length, notwithstanding their ungenerous repudiation of his aid, the theory Lord Amberley propounded last year in the *Fortnightly Review* with a boldness and brusquerie which made it less mischievous because more palpably absurd. When they have found anything to say on the grave matters handled, and handled with earnestness and ability, by the writers in *The Church and the World*, we shall be happy to listen to them. As yet they have left the field clear to their rivals in literature as well as in the active work of the Church.

Without instituting any comparison as to their solid value, we may say at once that the third volume of Mr. Shipley's series contains more matter of general interest, and will supply more attractive reading, than the second. Indeed, our chief complaint against the opening paper, by Dr. Littledale, is that having taken it up for a cursory glance, under pressure of other engagements, we were unable to put it down till we had read to the end. Neither the first nor the second Report of the Ritual Commission deserves in itself a tithe of the elaborate criticism he has expended upon it; the latter indeed has received more than its due, in the way of attention, in the condign chastisement administered by the *Saturday Review*. But his essay contains much more than its title would necessarily import.

After a scathing exposure of the inadequate composition, the gross unfairness, and the grotesque incompetence of the Commission, he proceeds to give a clear and uncompromising account of the antecedents, position, and policy of the Ritualist or Catholic party in the Church. The startling assertion that "there were actually more prelates appointed in the twenty-five years from 1660 to 1685, who have achieved distinction in their office, and left their mark for good on the Church of England, than in the 182 years which have since elapsed," is not made without being proved in detail, and proved beyond possibility of denial. Indeed Dr. Littledale's examination of the habitual attitude of the Episcopate towards the Catholic movement from 1853 downwards, is one of the most instructive portions of his essay. With few and slight exceptions they have never helped, and have usually done their best to hinder, its progress, being always however ready to claim and make capital out of what has been gained in spite of them, as a plea for opposing any further advance in the same direction. It was an easier, though even more unsavoury task, to unmask the true character of the Protestant opposition. Suffice it to put on record here that the Stoke Newington rioters of last autumn marched to the war-cry of "the accursed Virgin Mary," and that the infamous *Confessional Unmasked*, of which 50,000 copies have been disseminated by the "Protestant Electoral Union," was actually offered for sale *to the girls of Clapham Boarding-school* at a "Church Association" meeting, with a clergyman in the chair, and other clergymen on the platform! It is well such facts should be known, but we do not care to dwell upon them. After all, the most noticeable feature in Dr. Littledale's essay is its breadth of thought and masterly grasp of the bearings of the question. Every one knows that he is in the habit of using strong language—many may think too strong—against persons or systems he disapproves. That is a matter of taste and discretion we do not care to meddle with here. The point to be observed is that he never indulges in mere aimless abuse; if he uses ugly names he gives his reasons for believing them to be appropriate, and, unlike most controversialists of decided views, he is always ready to point out the good points in an opponent's case.* We call special attention to this because it

* The criticism on an article in the *Christian Remembrancer* in a recent number of the *Guardian*, that to make assertions without proving them is "too like Dr. Littledale," was doubly infelicitous. There are few writers less open to such a censure, except, perhaps, the reviewer against whom it was directed, who is one of the most learned and accurate of historical critics living.

is an element in theological controversy so greatly needed and so seldom found. It is no credit to a man, as Dr. Newman has somewhere observed, to be temperate in his language, who is doubtful or indifferent in his belief, though the world often awards the praise of moderation to those who have really no feelings to control, and no convictions to express. Such men, whatever their powers, will exercise no lasting influence on their fellows. But it is of great importance, on all grounds, that those who are enthusiastic should also learn to be impartial, and should conscientiously restrain, not the strength of their convictions (for a conviction rightly formed cannot be held too strongly), but the natural tendency of an earnest mind to let conviction darken into prejudice. Few heresies have arisen which were not, at least in their origin, the distortion or the exaggeration of some half-forgotten truth. "Error only lives by virtue of the truth which it contains," and as Sinbad's magnetic island attracted to itself all the iron out of the passing ships, it is the Church's office to discriminate and make her own whatever truth is to be found embedded in the erroneous systems around her. Dr. Littledale has applied this principle to the Evangelical and Broad Church parties in the English Church, and we quote one passage of his essay bearing on the subject, not by any means as the most striking, but in the hope of inducing our readers to look further for themselves.

"We are thoroughly aware that, though particular tenets, now held by the Puritan and Latitudinarian schools, are open to grave objection, yet the schools themselves, in their general temper of mind, are necessary for the full development of a Church. A healthy Low-Church element tends to keep in relief the great truth of individual responsibility, sometimes forgotten in the yet grander truth of Catholic brotherhood. It acts like the French system of drill, which, though looser and less adapted for concentrated masses than the English method, yet makes each soldier, taken apart, far more self-helpful and dextrous. Again, the Broad-Church party has its use. Not that which it so boastfully proclaims as its peculiar mission, to teach toleration, for it never extends that toleration to the uncompromising preachment of historical Christianity. That imposture was unmasked but the other day by the false step of the protagonist of the satyric drama of Toleration, Dean Stanley, in refusing Westminster Abbey to the Bishops at the Lambeth Conference, and his deeper plunge into the mire by his shuffling and insincere apology, addressed first to the Archbishop, and then reiterated in brief to the Bishop of Vermont, and replied to by that aged prelate in a stinging reproof. . . .

The real use of the Broad-Church party is, that it acts as a useful check on over-clericalism, whenever that danger is imminent, and brings the Priesthood back to primary social truths and duties, sometimes forgotten in the strife of tongues. It represents, when at its best, the mere human side of Christianity with great faithfulness; and therefore it cannot be spared, though many of its members might depart without arousing any special pangs in those they left behind."

It would obviously be impossible, within the limits of a single article, to attempt anything like a detailed notice of the seventeen essays in this volume. We may call attention in passing to the second, from "a Mother," on the "Training of Girls," and a somewhat kindred paper—possibly from the same hand—on the "Immoral Literature" of the day. The writer has not carried the investigation as far as, we fear, it might be carried into the depravities of our cheap literature for the lower classes. The *Illustrated Police News*, and similar publications, if we may judge from recent revelations of youthful crime, seem to be exercising a most contaminating fascination over the minds of quite young boys. In such cases as that of the two children—for they are only twelve and fourteen respectively—now undergoing trial for the murderous assault on Mrs. Nunn, one can hardly doubt that the criminals are more sinned against than sinning, judged by a moral standard. And it certainly, as the essayist remarks, falls within the responsibility of the Church to see to this crying evil. Another valuable paper, on a very different subject, which we must content ourselves with barely mentioning, is Mr. Wood's on the Supernatural. At the same time it appears to us that a more systematic handling of the subject, with direct reference to modern forms of scepticism, would have been desirable. The essay is too dry and technical, without being sufficiently clear and trenchant. Mr. Cheyne's learned and thoughtful dissertation on "Prayers for the Dead," will be read with additional interest as coming from a venerable confessor of Eucharistic doctrine, and both the subject and the authorship go far to disarm criticism. It hardly however strikes us as so satisfactory and complete as Canon Humble's exhaustive defence of the "Invocation of Saints," and the Scriptural argument is certainly susceptible of fuller treatment, especially in connection with Macc. xii. 45, and ii. Tim. i. 18. The former passage gives conclusive evidence of the Jewish practice for centuries before the time of our Lord, and whatever He did not censure in the usages of the Synagogue He indirectly sanctioned; the latter witnesses incidentally, and therefore all the

more forcibly, to the apostolic adoption of that usage. It is a pity again that, in referring to a communicated article in our January number by an Eastern, on the "Orthodox Doctrine of the Departed," Mr. Cheyne should not have also noticed the comments made upon it in the following number by a Latin Catholic. But we have no desire to pick holes in what, after all, is a noble vindication of a most important devotion still too little practised among us.

We have already mentioned Mr. Humble's paper on "Invocation of Saints and Angels," which is quite one of the best in the volume. Indeed, with the exception of the excellent commentary on Article XXII. in the second volume of Bishop Forbes' recent work, we know nothing from the pen of an Anglican writer to compare with it. The essayist lays down, with perfect justice, that "nowhere shall we find a more moderate statement of practical belief in this matter than the Fathers of Trent have put forth," and he has virtually made the Tridentine statement the text of his disquisition. It is a calm and judicial investigation of the whole question, both in its doctrinal and historical bearings, tracing out the gradual development of the Church's mind upon it. When indeed the Canon says that the Vincentian rule *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, is true of faith but not of practice, his language is, to say the least, inaccurate. Faith and practice are closely conjoined, and the rule is only true in a certain sense of either. S. Vincent himself insists that there must be a continual advance, though not a change, of faith;* and Canon Humble has pointed out in forcible language the absurdity of the lists of dates "for the introduction of Romanist errors," so common in Protestant manuals. "Controverted points cannot be settled in a line. An ecclesiastical decision implies a long list of *pros* and *cons;* and the *pros* are as likely to be right as the *cons*. The fact of a decision being made at a given time presupposes long previous practice," and, we may add, long previous belief. The cumulative force of the argument in this masterly essay would only be injured by analysis or selection, and we shall therefore content ourselves with quoting one eloquent passage, and exhorting our readers to study the whole for themselves:—

"If we on our parts would take the opposite line, and would strive, by putting forth the loving characteristics of the Gospel, the intense purity and lovingness of the Blessed

* See the passage from his *Commoniterium* quoted at length in Oxenham's *Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*, Introduction, p. 12.

Virgin Mary, our dear Mother in Christ; and if our people were taught to reverence her and the rest of the Saints, at the head of whom she stands; to address their Guardian Angel; and to remember that when they sin, they not merely offend God, but cause their immediate attendant Spirit to cover his face in shame and confusion, we should have an incentive to urge which it is not in man pertinaciously to resist.. Once convince men of the reality of the Angel's presence and guardianship—once persuade them that the Saints are intensely interested in the result of their combat; and you have, at any rate, got a plea to urge with them which will, in many instances, give success to your expostulations. The doctrines of Saintly Intercession and Angelic Guardianship must move any one who has not a heart of stone. They are stepping-stones to higher things; indeed, to the highest of all—the love of God. Our moral disquisitions have failed; our people are sunk in sin; and we complain that they have got beyond our management. Let us try them with a fuller and more loving Gospel. The whole Hierarchy of Heaven will help us, if we will only ask for their aid, and ask aright, to conquer the evil which surrounds us; and they will support us with their prayers on our behalf whilst we are so engaged. We know not what power we lose by not seeking what we might so easily obtain."

Next in order, and hardly less important in its practical bearings, is Mr. Vaux's paper on "Missions and Preaching Orders," which comes in to supplement one of Mr. Baring Gould's in the first series. The suggestions for adapting the Prayer Book, as it stands, to mission purposes, and the illustration from an actual mission given in one of the large manufacturing towns, will be particularly valuable to clerical readers. The author has also largely availed himself of the experience of Roman Catholic Mission Orders. It is satisfactory to know that Missions, like Retreats, are rapidly becoming naturalized in the Church of England, and that one Religious Order has already been organized for this special work.

It is an easy transition from Mr. Vaux to Mr. Carter, who contributes a paper on "Retreats." Everything from his pen on the conduct of the spiritual life is sure to be valuable, and he appears to us to be more thoroughly at home in the theory and practice of Retreats than of Religious Vows, on which he wrote in a previous volume. His acquaintance with the management of this grand engine, so to say, of sanctification—which is to the clergy and the educated classes what missions are to the people generally—is derived, as our

readers are well aware, not only from books but from personal experience. Mr. Carter is in fact more sought after than, perhaps, any other Anglican priest for conducting the annual Retreats, which are increasing year by year, and not undeservedly so. Nothing can be more admirable than his explanation and defence of the *Spiritual Exercises* of S. Ignatius, as "a model system, to which all directors of Retreats must look as the primary law of every scheme of instruction to be adopted." They are, as he justly observes, singularly free from any allusion to controverted points; even such obvious incidents of Catholic devotion as the honour of our Lady and the Saints are barely touched upon. "They are simply a masterly combination of the more normal and practical truths which concern the soul of every man." There cannot be a grosser or more ludicrous misconception than the popular Protestant notion expressed by a writer in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, whom Mr. Carter quotes, that the *Exercises* are "an attempt to purchase material ecstacies by the sacrifice of intellect and conscience." It is doubtful if those who so write have ever taken the trouble to read the directions they so ignorantly misconstrue, and abundantly certain that they have never dreamt of acting upon them. Mr. Carter passes from the general principle to the practical details of Retreats, and we need only remind our readers that none are better qualified to speak with authority on the subject. He is undoubtedly right in principle about the rule of silence, though it may often require some modifications in practice.* We are rather surprised however that *walking* beyond the house where the Retreat is being held, should be spoken of as allowable. Surely nothing can be more distracting from the multiplicity of fresh images presented to the eye, and through it to the mind; nor is it ever allowed in Roman Retreats. There are some excellent remarks on clerical training, towards the close of the essay.

We cannot do more than briefly indicate the salient points of Mr. Baring Gould's very interesting paper on the "Origin of Schools of Thought in the English Church." It might be more accurately described as a sketch of the history and present relations of the Catholic and Sceptical principles. Mr. Gould, like Mr. Clay and his fellow essayists, has perceived that the religious crisis of the day ultimately hinges on the conflicting claims of Revelation

* At the Gésu at Rome a father called *Padre Confortatore*, who is not the director of the Retreat, is sent occasionally to talk with the exercitant during recreation time.

and Rationalism. The contest lies between the adherents of a supernatural dogma and the Church to whose guardianship it is entrusted, and those who in fact, if not in name, are nothing more—often something less—than deists. "The passing lights of compromise," says one of the writers on *Church Policy*, "will hardly hold out longer. . . We must either go backwards or forwards; we cannot, as Protestants do, reject the authority of tradition, whilst yet we practically assume, on no better authority, all our first premises. Protestantism, as a phase of progress, has done its work." The Church, according to another of them, has been hitherto dependent on the infallibility of Popes, or Councils, or the Bible. We got rid of Popes and Councils at the Reformation, and now the great Reformation doctrine of plenary inspiration "has broken like packthread before the rising gales of scientific discovery and historical research." And Mr. Clay himself clinches their assertions by observing that "every step towards Rationalism has been the result, direct or indirect, of some fresh acquisition of positive knowledge." He is right enough in another remark, that "if you scratch a strong Protestant, you will commonly find a good Papist beneath." In other words, Protestants go by tradition fully as much as Papists, only their traditions are destitute, even in their own eyes, of any shadow of claim to authority, while yet they are inconsistently exempted by a jealous but natural instinct from the intrusion of criticism. This, then, is the situation Mr. Baring Gould has to consider. To state it in his own words, "Latitudinarianism and Catholicism have each an intelligible standing-ground in the world of thought; but Protestantism has absolutely none. If the Incarnation be a fact, Protestantism cannot reasonably be deduced from it." The Reformation undermined the basis of Christian belief by setting the witnesses—Scripture and Tradition—in apparent antagonism. Theology had at one time intruded into a domain where science was rightfully supreme. Protestantism did not improve matters by rejecting the Catholic theology on its own ground, and putting forward, in lieu of Church authority, a theory of verbal inspiration which ignored the human element in Scripture altogether. The Reformation evoked a spirit it was powerless to control, and it was inevitable that its own children should prey on its vitals. Biblical infallibility, proving and interpreting itself, developed into that scheme of "free handling, in a becoming spirit," which soon made as short work with the Bible as the Reformers had made with the Catholic tradition. "When the hypothesis of the Book had done its work, it was subjected in turn to examination by the

light of science, and its claims were freely canvassed." And Scepticism, as it advanced, produced the Catholic reaction. No doubt Continental Catholicism has also given birth to Scepticism, for it was forced at the Reformation into an unnatural position of resistance to progress and freedom of thought, from which it has never thoroughly extricated itself. But this intolerance, as the author adds, is so far from being characteristic of the Church, that it is the exact converse of her mode of proceeding in the middle ages, when she did her utmost to foster philosophy, science, and art. Its true and only secure remedy will be found in the re-union of the Latin and Teutonic races, unhappily dissevered for the last three centuries, in one fold and one faith. The following extract may serve to illustrate the general scope of the essay:—

"On the supposition that a Revelation has been made to man, it must be perceived that such a Revelation, as emanating from the Creator of mind, cannot be obstructive to reason, but rather calculated to facilitate its progress. And also, on the same supposition, it is obvious that the extent of surface over which speculation ranged is narrowed, so that inquiry has to flow between definite barriers, whilst, thereby, its channel is deepened, and its force is concentrated. These barriers can never be overleaped or swept away; and if speculation, instead of glancing along them towards the fields over which its stream may be distributed to fertilize, or into the deep courses where it may avail for the transport of the treasures of learning and discovery, will insist on surging up, and exerting its force to overthrow the adamantine walls of Truth, a counter-current will be produced, which will roll back into the old abandoned channels."

There is an occasional dash of exaggeration about Mr. Gould's language, which an unfriendly critic might use with some apparent effect against his argument. It is not true, for instance, to say that the Bible, apart from external evidence, "is on *precisely the same footing* as the Vedas, the Zendavesta, the Koran, the Popol Vuh, and the Book of Mormon." Internal evidence surely goes for something, though its form varies with different minds, and it can never be safely trusted to stand alone. So, again, to say that "all mystics" made the mistake of imagining Christianity to be a "a religion of the soul alone," betrays a complete ignorance of the Spanish school of Mystics, who emphatically represented the spirituality of common sense and common life, and conveys by no means a fair estimate of the rest. The subject is a special one, which

Mr. Baring Gould has probably not studied; he would have done better therefore to avoid an *obiter dictum* at once irrelevant and incorrect. But his essay, as a whole, deserves high praise, and we heartily commend it to the notice of our readers.

Mr. Clay's volume does not call for any lengthened criticism here. We have been constantly reminded in reading it of a story current in Germany some years ago about the founder of a new sect, who replied to an inquiry about its doctrines, "*Sehan sie, zuerst es gibt kein Trinität!*" The main drift of the book may be gathered from our previous extracts, and is fairly summed up in an article on the Ritual Commission, which appeared about a fortnight ago in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, explaining with admirable clearness that Liberalism, in a theological sense, does not mean liberality towards those who differ from you.* On the contrary, the writer was careful to point out that, where Liberals are sure of their ground—and they have got a pretty firm hold of the negative side of their theology already—they are just as much bound as their opponents to use all legitimate means for promoting the triumph of truth. If, to adopt his own illustration, a believer in Eucharistic doctrine feels it his duty to do all in his power to promote its general acceptance, it is equally the duty of those who think a belief in the Real Presence a childish superstition to make every effort for its suppression. And the contest must be fought out till one side or the other gains the victory. The Broad Church essayists say much the same in more courteous, though hardly more circuitous, language. "The infallibility of the intellect" is their watchword; and as Mr. Clay expressly admits, what of course is perfectly true, that "as a fact ninety-nine persons out of a hundred, if not nine hundred and ninety-nine out of a thousand, are incompetent to choose their own creed," what his party really aims at is to convert the National Church into an engine for the dogmatic teaching of the non-existence of supernatural dogma. They do not seek for the toleration of all forms of opinion, but for the exclusive domination of their own; and they are quite prepared to accept the aid of the Legislature, if it can be obtained, for crushing the Catholic opposition. Their claim for "liberty of thought and speech" is a convenient euphemism for the claim to put down those who will not speak or think liberally, that is, who uphold a divine

* See the *Pall Mall Gazette* for June 13th, 1868.

authority for a dogmatic creed.* We always thought, and said we thought, that this was what they really meant. But we are none the less indebted to them for their frank avowal that we were right. Henceforth there need be no mistake. They have told us themselves that the time for compromise is past.

* We are speaking, of course, of the party, as such; and the general scope and language of Mr. Clay's volume entirely bears out the direct assertions of the *Pall Mall*. But there are naturally some differences among its individual contributors. Mr. Llewellyn Davies and Mr. Seeley write in a much more temperate and really liberal, as well as more Christian, spirit than the rest.

Art. XX.—THE SANCTUARIES OF ANGLICAN CHURCHES.

1. *The Ecclesiologist.* London: 1867.
2. *Eglises Principales de l'Europe.* Folio: Milan.
3. *Die alt-Christlichen Bauwerke von Ravenna.* Berlin: 1842.
4. *Report of the Incorporated Church Building Society.* London: 1867.
5. *The Church of our Fathers.* By D. Rock, D.D. In Four Volumes. London: Dolman, 1849.

We know not how to explain the reason, but the fact remains that very few of our modern churches come up to the ancient standards, either in general conception or in minute detail. With all our learning and boasted experience we have exceedingly little to show as evidencing any unusual advance in the direction of an architectual triumph. Some few of our leading architects—men who consistently act on principle, and scout the shifting "views" and adroit tactics of the renowned Mr. Compo—have done their best most creditably in accordance with the demands upon them and the opportunities offered; but on the whole the architecture of the Victorian era promises to be a singular jumble of all styles, without unity, without consistency, and without effect.*

Our remarks on the present occasion will have reference mainly to ecclesiastical buildings, and more especially to the sanctuaries of some recent churches; but the poverty of conception and feebleness of design which is so apparent in secular buildings are by no means without their influence upon modern churches: while the spirit and temper in which the old architects wrought seem to be altogether things of the past. With all our boasted advantages, with all the appliances of modern art, we find ourselves unquestionably behind the architects of mediæval times, and cursed with the perpetration of mistakes in which blunders and anachronisms are as plentiful as blackberries in autumn.

Nothing can be more striking than the inability of those

* To take the case of the walls, railings, lamps, and cloister in the Palace Yard, at Westminister, it would be altogether impossible to find anything equal to them for incongruity of style and vulgarity of design. Altogether failing to harmonize with the creditable Third Pointed work of Sir C. Barry and Mr. A. Welby Pugin, they offend every canon of good taste by their weak conception, poor design, and meretricious ornamentation.

who plan new churches to adapt their plans to the places and positions which they are intended to occupy. S. Barnabas', Pimlico, for example, built nearly twenty years ago, is a signal instance of the mistake made in putting up an edifice founded after a country-church model in a thickly-populated city neighbourhood. S. Barnabas' would have been quite in place on the green slope of a hill, surrounded by thickets and trees, and standing in its own churchyard just beyond the inhabited portion of a country village; but surrounded as it is by houses and narrow streets of the ordinary town type, its position is incongruous and its plan a mistake. A town church should be lofty, with a large nave for the worshippers, and a broad and spacious chancel for the celebration of the Church's rites and Divine service. Sham chapels on either side the chancel, in which sham chapels there are no altars and no arrangement for such, are altogether a mistake. The organ should stand in a chamber on one side of the choir, and vestries for the choir and clergy on the other side, but these should all be so planned and placed as to look what they are, and not what they are not, so that reality might at once characterise the building. Aisles of course there should be, as well to the choir as to the nave, but only as ambulatories and for processions, not to be choked up with seats and benches; and the aisles should never be so obtrusive in their external elevation as to detract from the general dignity and particular height of the nave and choir. Light should be had from the clerestory, for people do not want windows at their elbows, but above their heads, more especially in town churches, by which reasonable arrangement the sounds of the streets around and unwelcome draughts are avoided. All this is, of course, practical enough, and will be seen to be so. As regards the arrangements of sanctuaries, however, while practical matters—that is sound and proper ritual necessities—should be primarily considered, divergencies of taste and variety of embellishment may be not only properly tolerated, but should be actively welcomed. Unfortunately, in too many cases, there are such conflicting interests and such divergent tastes to be considered, that a hopeless and bungling compromise as regards sanctuary, altar, reredos, east wall and east window, is unfortunately sealed by the perplexed architect, and pedantic ugliness in Caen stone and alabaster left to annoy and irritate those who look upon it.

From generals, however, we must go to particulars to make our meaning clear and to point a moral:—

1. *The Church of SS. Peter and Paul, Wymering, diocese of*

Winchester. One of the most complete and efficiently-restored village churches in any part of England is this, of which restoration Mr. Street was the architect. The nave is severe and simple in the extreme. In a somewhat too conservative spirit the old low and narrow chancel-arch was retained, which hides the view of the sanctuary. The pulpit is awkwardly placed. It should have stood some feet more to the south. The chancel is a perfect gem, admirably arranged and fitted in a costly and proper manner. The tracery of the east window of three lights, early Second Pointed in character, is particularly fine; and the glass, with Our Blessed Lady and her Divine Child, in the centre light, most effective and good in tone. Happily it is not overdone with heavy colours, white glass not being sparsely used. In the reredos of three arcades which stands away from the east wall, the figures are a little too large, but, on the other hand, the Crucifix stands out well, and the whole plan and conception are eminently Catholic and completely successful.

2. *S. Nicholas', Cuddington, Bucks, diocese of Oxford.* This church, which consists of a chancel, nave with aisles and south porch, and tower and turret at the west end, was restored some years ago by Mr. Street. Most unjustifiably he removed a good Second Pointed chancel-screen, and put up nothing in its place. It is, however, a restoration remarkable for the general excellence and propriety of its sanctuary arrangements, and one which has happily set the fashion in that dreary part of Buckinghamshire—we mean dreary spiritually, for the country is beautiful and the Vale of Aylesbury near—which lies between the county-town and Thame. The altar of Cuddington church is of good proportions, well elevated and properly vested, but the reredos is not very effective, while the glass in the east window, especially the drawing of our Blessed Saviour's figure on the cross, is anything but satisfactory. On the whole, however, notwithstanding the defects pointed out, this is an admirable example of a well-restored village church.

3. *S. Mary's, Aylesbury, Bucks, diocese of Oxford.* This is a remarkably fine building, cruciform, consisting of chancel with aisles, lady-chapel parallel with chancel, central tower, transepts, nave with aisles, side chapels, clerestory, south-west porch, and doors at the north, west, and at the extremity of the north transept. It has been restored with creditable munificence, in a conservative spirit, and with some effect by Mr. Gilbert Scott, and as far as the nave is concerned—putting aside an erection for reading the prayers in—the restoration is to be commended. But the chancel is a signal failure, and

the sanctuary one of the poorest and most ineffective, for such a sized church, in England. The level of the chancel-floor ought to have been raised, and the altar-table should have been of greater height, size, and general dignity. The ugly string-course under the east window, which is filled with indifferent stained glass, is quite an eyesore, and the whole effect of this part of the choir miserably disappointing, and altogether unworthy of so fine a building. The arrangement here is but a type of similar "restorations" elsewhere. Mr. Gilbert Scott is the most ineffective architect in treating a sanctuary. Apparently he gives no time nor attention to it. His stalls are passable; his pulpits are sometimes admirable, and his fonts good, but his altars are "low decent tables," without dignity, without height, and without any Catholic symbolism.

Throughout the length and breadth of the land such restorations as these have been carried out with a generous devotion, good feeling, and reputable success which can leave no doubt on the minds of those who note such improvements, of the reality and depth of the Catholic Revival. The architectural and ecclesiological movements of Oxford and Cambridge respectively have done a wonderful work. No rural deanery is unaffected: no school of thought uninfluenced. Modern Roman Catholics in England, as the late Mr. Welby Pugin admitted, caught the infection of good taste from members of the ancient Church of England: and Dissenters have followed in their wake. On the part of the Church long steps have been taken onwards and forwards. The robbery, rapine, destruction, and desolation caused by the Reformation are now beginning to be undone by the new Reformation of the present era. But we must not stop at the point at which we have arrived. We must press on. When one point is gained, after due examination, a vigorous attack, a successful defence and a sure triumph, we must go forward to win another point. Apostolic craft must guide us and direct. Nothing must be left undone to re-Catholicize England. And as people learn more by what they see than by what they hear, the externals of Catholicity must be definite, truth-telling, attractive, beautiful, and grand. Restored and new churches we have, with one defect however, *viz.*—inadequate altars, placed in mean and poverty-stricken sanctuaries. To this defect, therefore, the attention of architects, church restorers, clergymen, and active laymen should be directed, in order that the remaining weak points, and incomplete restorations, may be amended in the future, and this as soon as possible.

We will briefly criticise a few more of our more recent and

prominent churches in order to point out what we need and where our present defects lie.

4. *All Saints', Margaret Street, diocese of London.* People may reasonably take different sides as to the wisdom of having adopted the peculiar style which Mr. Butterfield has here made use of. They may hold, as we ourselves hold, that there is a marked want of repose in parts of the church, and that many of the contrasts are too powerful and marked, while the whole building is evidently eclectic and foreign-looking. All this may be held, and yet the church may be exhibited to foreign ecclesiastics as a good specimen of what the Catholic Revival has already accomplished in England. As regards the sanctuary, however, we cannot refrain from criticism. The character of the roof-colouring of the chancel, and the frescoes on the east wall, are entirely out of harmony with the magnificent and most perfect traceried arches on either side. Essentially different principles underlie the designs of each. Moreover the actual plan of the sanctuary is imperfect, because height and dignity are sorely wanted to the altar. Here Mr. Butterfield has failed. And though the new altar-cross and fresh hangings adopted since the opening of the church are unquestionable improvements, the general depressed appearance of the holy table is incurably bad. For a grand function the whole sanctuary is small and inadequate.

5. *S. Alban's, Holborn, diocese of London.* With the exception of the east end of the chancel, the dimensions and elevation of the altar and the reredos, this church is remarkable for its dignity and simplicity. There may be something in Mr. W. Burges' criticisms in the Third Series of *The Church and the World,* and a decided objection to the use of drain pipes instead of Purbeck marble or Cornish serpentine for pillars, but no one will deny that the general effect of the nave is excellent, or that the western part of the church is most original and striking. But when we turn eastwards we cannot hold that the architect deserves other than vigorous condemnation. The diaper in alabaster below, the frightful reredos and ill-proportioned cross set in the queer diamond-looking panel behind the holy table, with the repeated squares of red-ochred frescoes above, some of which are ludicrous caricatures and others contain archaisms run wild, all give an appearance of crude bad taste which none but a crotchetty architect would have cared to perpetrate. Of course there are many people who will disagree with our comments, being prepared to follow Mr. Butterfield, or any other great architect, whithersoever he may lead; others, again, will overlook the

defects indicated on account of the heartiness and beauty of the services and the Catholicity of the teaching at S. Alban's: but no one whose opinion is worth a brass farthing would dream of defending the obviously bad design of S. Alban's east end. The clerical authorities at that church have certainly made the best of their sanctuary, but the altar, of its present small size and insufficient elevation, will always remain an eyesore to a competent critic, as will also the eccentric cross, so ill-designed and out of proportion, on the reredos above.*

6. *S. Paul's, Brighton, diocese of Chichester.*. We need not stay to describe this church, which is neither new nor very remarkable in its architecture. Common-place reigns everywhere except in the east end, which is exceedingly effective, though the screen (without any rood) deserves no praise. The East window, both as regards its tracery and glass, is very fine: the arrangements of the altar are excellent and dignified, and the painting behind, though quaint and ambitious, not altogether a failure. Throughout the church the stained glass is full of feeling and rich in colour, but the miserable want of height apparent, and the overpowering feeling of depression which its internal gloom produces, render its general type one to be avoided, rather than followed by church architects.

7. *S. John the Baptist's, Froome Selwood, diocese of Bath and Wells.* This noble church, which has been most efficiently restored, is one of the finest ecclesiastical buildings in the West of England. For completeness we know of no modern restoration which can at all compete with it. The lady-chapel is a triumph of art, and displays that growing devotion to the Blessed Mother of God which many believe will spread very rapidly in the Church of England of these latter days. At Froome both the high altar and Our Lady's altar are well planned and effective. The image over the latter will, of course, be put into some other place at a future time, in order that another may more properly fill the niche. As regards the high altar and the general arrangements of the sanctuary, nothing is wanting, so that services are now celebrated here

* The ledges behind, especially on festivals, are far too crowded with masses of flowers and thin tapers to harmonize with the general severity of the church, and remind us unpleasantly of the "gim-cracks," as the late Mr. Welby Pugin styled them, so common in Roman Catholic chapels. Anything more incongruous and hideous, too, than some of the banners from Belgium, recently imported into certain of the London churches, it would be impossible to find. They display the combined taste of the milliner, upholsterer, and valentine-painter, and are certainly the reverse of devotional.

with a precision, a grandeur, and a solemnity, unknown in the diocese since the days of blasphemy and rebuke three centuries ago.

8. *S. Augustine's, Haggerstone, diocese of London.* Whoever may have been the architect of this new and incomplete building, he certainly has much to learn. The general work is poor, though there is a certain amount of dignity in the plan, and some effectiveness in the arrangement of the sanctuary. The choir might have been raised still higher with still greater effect, and so might the sanctuary proper. The altar however is dignified and of good proportions, but the moveable brass cross does not stand out with sufficient distinctness. The sloped baldachino above—borrowed from the convent chapel of Clewer—is good in intention, but poor both in design and detail. The Crucifix, with Our Lady and S. John, gives the church a most Catholic appearance, but the figures—much too large for their position—want both feeling and repose. They are coarse and pagan in their type, and the drapery and *pose* are very bad. Here the services are carefully and devoutly rendered, while the choir—with an evident taste for Anglican music, however,—do their part well.

9. *S. Michael and All Angels', Shoreditch, diocese of London.* This church is a very remarkable building, by a very rising architect—Mr. Brooks. It is well planned, full of dignity and point, and is evidently founded on a true and valuable type. The sanctuary arrangements are most excellent, while there are few churches in England which possess so telling and effective a reredos as is found here. Still the figures, being so near the eye, strike us as too large and out of proportion both to the size of the church and the altar. And this defect is a common fault everywhere. The old reredoses, especially those of late Second Pointed and early Third Pointed work, of which many remain, imageless and bare, usually contained figures which did not attract the eye by disproportionate size or pronounced attitude; and it would be well if our architects followed these ancient precedents. Figures which are to appear within ten feet of the looker-on should be of a different size and character to those which are to be placed in niches forty feet from the ground.* Independent of which, they dwarf the altar, and carry away the eye from the altar cross, which ought to be the point towards which all things converge and with which no *ornamentum* should in any degree interfere.

* The figures on either side the screen door at Exeter College, Oxford, are too large for their niches—an instance of unpardonable blundering on the part even of Mr. G. Scott.

10. *S. Peter's, Old Gravel Lane, diocese of London.* A most effective church is this, a little coarse perhaps in its details, but evidencing no small ability and knowledge of Catholic needs on the part of the architect. The sanctuary is particularly well planned, and the altar a most prominent feature in the church. The reredos, at present incomplete, will no doubt add greatly to the chancel's general effect. The rises in the sanctuary are planned with great skill and care.

11. *S. Mary Magdalene's, Munster Square, diocese of London.* Quite recently the sanctuary of this church has been re-arranged with judgment and success. For dignity and effect there are few churches superior to this in London. We know of none in which clerestory windows are wanted where height and space are nevertheless so apparent. The altar is very effective, and so too are the new polychromatic decorations around and about it. The late Mr. Carpenter, before he was taken from us, learnt to note the necessity, if dignity is to be attained, of getting a good and sufficient space above the altar for the necessary legal *ornamenta*, and this is found here. Instead of having a horizontal string-course immediately opposite the celebrant's eyes, he admitted that no string course ought to be less than eight feet from the level of the altar-slab. What he wisely held in theory, at S. Mary Magdalene's he has accomplished in practice. The ritual of the services here, more especially that of the Christian Sacrifice, is below the present improved ecclesiological type of the Church. When there is a wrong and right way of doing things—though they be little things—it is better to follow the right, even though a certain amount of practical education be undergone to accomplish so good and profitable an end.

12. *S. Peter's, Vauxhall, diocese of Winchester.*—This Church, one of the most successful buildings of the present revival, is full of dignity in its general aspect and remarkably well arranged. We should, however, have preferred that the levels of the choir had been far higher than they now appear: for by such an alteration very much greater effect would have been obtained. On the other hand the choir stalls are a little too high, and greater width is certainly needed for the sanctuary. The reredos, though in some respects effective, is obviously the weak point of this part of the building, and the cross, hugely out of all proper proportion, is by no means what it ought to have been. It overpowers the Holy Table, and introduces an element which mars the general harmony of the rest of the building. This is all the more so, because the Altar is not so long as it might have been with effect.

The incised frescoes here are admirable, but we should have preferred a little more colour in their treatment. Our buildings, however, and more especially our churches, have been so long white-washed and desolate, that colour, when used at all, is used far too seldom and with two little depth and boldness. The Venetian mosaics behind the Altar are coarse and rude. This style of ornamentation is excellent when placed some distance from the eye, but is not at all calculated for the position which it occupies here.

13. *All Saints', York Street, Lambeth, diocese of Winchester.* This building, one of the most extraordinary in style of any south of the Thames, or possibly north of the Thames too, has for some years been given up to dirt and desolation. Built by an architect who evidently had extremely little idea what a church should be, it is well that in the eclectic erection made, he has not been altogether so unsuccessful as might have been the case. The restoration, repair, and re-arrangement of the Church recently effected under Mr. Jewell Withers' direction and personal superintendence, deserves great praise: for now the sanctuary is certainly one of the most effective in London, and only shows what may be done with even the most hopelessly bad building if good taste and Catholic feeling are practically brought to bear on the same. Added to the excellent plan and arrangements both of choir and apse, which cannot be surpassed either for convenience or effect, a new reredos has been presented and erected by the well-known sculptor Mr. Thomas Earp, senior Churchwarden of All Saints', which is a master-piece of Christian art both as regards design and execution. The following description of it is worthy of being reproduced:—

"This reredos, which is of the value of £200, is mainly from the design of Mr. John Bentley, architect, of Southampton Street, and may be said to be one of the most beautiful, both as regards materials and execution, of any such works in the metropolis. It recalls to our mind some of the most remarkable specimens of North Italian sculpture, and is in every respect a very gem of the highest type of Christian art in the Victorian revival. The super-altar is of the Isle of Man limestone, or black marble. Above this, the reredos is divided into panels by vertical bands of Cornish or green serpentine marble, the panels being of Staffordshire alabaster, and these, again, are in the next stage above subdivided into quatrefoils moulded, on the background of which are a series of six subjects of the Virtues overcoming the Vices, as Charity overcoming Avarice; Hope overcoming Despair; Concord overcoming Discord; Faith

overcoming Idolatry; Temperance overcoming Gluttony; and Chastity overcoming Lust. These are also enriched with boldly projecting white Derbyshire spars on a ground of red and green marble, carrying out the line of quartrefoils. The arcading above this is of Caen stone, supported at either end with triple columns of dark serpentine marble, having an elaborately carved cornice, jewelled on its crest with Derbyshire spars of a conical form projecting boldly. This arcade is of three vesica-shaped compartments, the centre containing the Cross of white alabaster, richly jewelled, with spars, on a ground of Languedoc red marble, panelled with the emblems of the four Evangelists in alabaster, incised. On the Epistle side is an incised representation in alabaster of the Annunciation, with the Angel Gabriel delivering the message, 'Hail! thou that art highly-favoured.' The design is most ably carried out, and tells its story well. The north compartment is filled with an elaborately incised representation, on white alabaster, of the Holy Women and the Angels at the Sepulchre, the ground of which is filled with coloured marbles in geometrical pattern, the nimbi of the figures being of Venetian gold glass. The columns dividing these arcades are of Irish green marble, carrying carved capitals, which support seated figures of the four Archangels, carved in white alabaster, with gilded wings. The reredos generally is a most appropriate addition to the church."—*Church News.*

The various churches already criticised are but types of hundreds of others. Restoration is being carried on with great energy on all sides. Its success, however, is often hopelessly marred by the crotchets and ignorance of those who direct its operations. For the future we earnestly hope that the clergy will set their faces against any changes in the sanctuaries of unrestored churches until the plans are such as that the ordinary requirements of decency and propriety in offering the Holy Sacrifice may be had. The altar should at least have a stone or marble slab, covering the whole top, or else let into the middle, marked with five crosses. There should be at least one super-altar or ledge behind for two lights and a cross or crucifix. If a crucifix be sculptured in the reredos, a plain cross will suffice on the ledge. There should be chalice, paten, two crewetts, an almsdish, wafer-box, lavabo-dish, thurible and incense boat, with at least two processional candlesticks. The altar should stand on a footpace for the celebrant, below which, in order, there should be steps respectively for the deacon and subdeacon. One credence table at least should be placed in every sanctuary, two are sometimes found to be practically very convenient; sedilia on

the south side for the three sacred ministers, with chairs or stools on either side for the acolytes, thurifer, boat-bearer, master of the ceremonies, crucifer, and other attendants. There should be likewise a piscina with a drain, standard candles for the horns of the altar, a handsome lectern facing eastwards, flanked by two other standard candlesticks for the antiphons at Evensong, as well as for the cantors and their assistants at high celebrations. Two additional candles, where custom sanctions the practice, may be used at the chanting of the Gospel and at the *Sanctus* prior to consecration. There should be abundant space for two rows of communicants to come up from the nave, and plenty of room for the said communicants, dividing into two parts after communion, to pass out at the side of the chancel into the aisles back to their places again. All this being practical and important, ought not to be passed over by those who plan the choirs and sanctuaries of our new churches. As regards the altar, we are extremely surprised that the canopy or baldachino has not been introduced. For large churches, collegiate or cathedral, such an introduction would produce dignity and effect. Good in their character as are the reredoses of Ely, Lichfield, and Hereford Cathedrals, they are a little tame and wanting in point. Though the canopy may not be "peculiarly English,"—the same remark may be made of Christianity itself—yet it certainly gives immense dignity to the altar. But if this be objected to, at least the cross may stand under a niche or canopy, either of wood, marble, alabaster, or stone. If this were so, the background might be richly inlaid, so that the cross of precious metal, standing out, might be seen from all parts of the church. Figures around and about the altar should all be made perfectly subservient to the altar-crucifix or cross, and no figures should be introduced into the interior of churches but those of canonized saints.

Again: as regards temporary decorations for festival seasons, we should recommend that architects study this question, and give the advantage of their skill, taste, and judgment to those who specially need them. What is worth doing at all is worth doing well. Just as we dislike to see a sanctuary made as much like a conservatory as possible, so we would discountenance the commonplace banners and constantly reiterated devices which are so much in vogue. The everlasting crosses, triangles, crossed keys, *A*'s and *Ω*'s, which are so popular, might occasionally be given up for something more artistic and full of teaching. The late Mr. Edward Sedding was one of the very best designers of banners, hangings, and altar

vestments, which the Catholic Revival has produced.* Nothing can be more striking than the contrast between his works and those of the advertising-tradesman type too commonly used in our churches.

Moreover, in addition to banners, it would be well to have large pieces of hangings and tapestry, for great festivals: some of which—after a proper design—might be made in the *applique* style. Figures of our Lord, our Lady, and the Saints; scenes from Gospel History, or incidents in the Lives of the Martyrs, might with propriety be represented; and, if adapted in size and character to the particular sanctuary they were to adorn, and the actual space of wall they were to cover, under the direction of a competent architect, would be far superior to the stripes of calico rag, covered with unreadable inscriptions in crimson and blue paper, which so offend refined tastes. Sculpture of all kinds, encaustic tiles, inlaid marbles, precious stones, and frescoes, should all be made use of for the adornment of our sanctuaries. More especially should the revived art of mosaic pictures for elevated positions be pressed into our service. Bartholi's *Sepulchres of Ancient Rome* (folio, 1738), contains some excellent specimens, as do also the published illustrations of the renowned Ciampini. At Rome the churches of S. Sabina, S. Maria Maggiore, and S. Andrew, contain remarkably early examples of Christian art worthy both of study and imitation; while those at Ravenna are not less interesting, and are perhaps of a higher artistic type. In the church at Murano, near Venice, an example of tessellated pavement is also worthy of note, while the pattern mosaic from S. Mark's in that city is even more striking.

Anything however, founded on true principles in art, that can add to the dignity of our sanctuaries and the beauty of our altars should, after due thought and consideration, be adopted in England by the artists of the Catholic Revival. We need men as architects who are bold and honest, who will lead rather than follow public opinion, and who will imitate those Re-unionists who, when the idea of Re-union was not simply unpopular, but was regarded as the eccentric fancy of peculiar enthusiasts, set forth their theories, based on truth, and by determination of purpose and honesty of sentiment, succeeded in carrying the day. To our allies of the pencil and the compasses we say, noting the necessity for action, "Go, and do thou likewise."

* While this paper is passing through the press, we learn with unfeigned regret of the premature death of Mr. Edward Sedding, a pupil of Mr. Street, and one of the most able, honest, and promising of the rising architects. His abilities were very high in more departments too than that in which he had worked with such feeling, taste, and power.—R. I. P.

FRAGMENTA VARIA.

No. V.—The Russian Synod and the British Bishops.

'N the suggestion of Peter the Great, the Russian Synod had ritten to the British Bishops to request them to send two of ıeir brethren to Russia, "to have a friendly conference in the 'ame and Spirit of Christ, with two that are to be chosen out f our brethren. Hereby," (such are the words of the Synodal ıtter, taken from an English translation made apparently by 'octor Brett), "the opinions, arguments, and persuasions of each arty may be more sincerely produced, and more clearly under-ood, and it may be more easily known what may be yielded nd given up by one to the other, what on the other hand may nd ought for conscience's sake to be absolutely denied. In the ıean time, no prejudice will befall either your commission or urs from such a private conference, nor the hopes of union be ltogether lost thereby. This is the opinion of our monarch oncerning this most holy negotiation; which seems indeed to ı the best. We desire that as soon as may be, you will let us ıow how it appears to you. In the mean time, God is seriously be entreated by each of us, to be merciful to us and you."

This letter was dated from Moscow, in February, 1723, but nes, the Protosyncellus (who was to be the bearer), being de-ed, there arrived in the meantime from Constantinople the wer of the Greek patriarchs, with the book of the eighteen ɔles made by Doritheus against the Calvinists, which the ɔd forwarded together with their own letter which had been ined, and another dated February 2nd, 1724, the contents hich were as follows: "A year is now passed since we ɜred letters to the Reverend Father the Protosyncellus, to be d to you, but some impediments have retarded his journey gland till this time. We acquainted you in them how well d the most potent Emperor of all the Russias, our gracious ign, was, to be further assured of your pious desire for ıce of the Churches, and what advice he gave of the best l to bring this holy endeavour to effect. And because continues constant in the same opinion, we send the me letters together with these, and we desire you will this delay rather for the sake of your own goodness, any other excuse that might be made. We also send vriting of the Greek prelates which we received from inople during the time that Father Protosyncellus was for his journey, being desired by a letter from them to

transmit it to you. In the meantime we desire your charity to know that if, according to the advice of our Sovereign, you will send two of your brethren to a conference, *which we again entreat you to do*, we may hope to bring our wishes to a more easy conclusion; which that at length He, the Lawgiver of love, the God of peace, the Father of mercies, may prosper, is our hearty prayer and desire," etc. After the death of Peter, the High Chancellor Gallofskin, in a letter dated the 16th of September, 1725, acknowledged the receipt of letters of condolence from the British Bishops, together with their compliments upon the new accession; and then with respect to the notification for an union continued thus: "As to the affair you have mentioned of an union, you may assure yourselves Her Imperial Majesty will support the same in such sort and manner as His late Imperial Majesty supported it; only at these mournful times your lordships will please to have some longer patience till the first opportunity I can have to represent to Her Imperial Majesty of all more at large, and then I do assure you, I will not fail to acquaint you thereof," etc. With which communications the correspondence closed.—Extract from note to Mouravieff's *History of the Russian Church*, translated by Blackmore.

CORRESPONDENCE.

PRESBYTERIANISM AND THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

Sir,—The writer of the article in the last UNION REVIEW on Presbyterianism has I think hardly given an accurate statement in all points of their tenets.

They do, after a manner, hold something analogous to "Apostolical Succession." They deny that Apostles or Bishops are a higher order than we consider Parish Priests. But they acknowledge in some sort "diverse orders in the Church," for with them the parish minister often has an "assistant," who is licensed to preach, and assists in conducting Divine Service, but he cannot administer either Baptism or the Lord's Supper until he is "ordained," which takes place on his obtaining a "living," when of course he is no longer "assistant."

Presbyterians are often ready to admit the diversity of Orders as above, and they have also church officers somewhat analogous to our churchwardens, whom they style "Deacons" or "Elders," and whom, having the charge of the relief of the poor, they hold to be similar to the early Deacons.

As I always think we are bound to set *truth* first, I have written this though aware it will subject me, with some, to the suspicion of a leaning to Presbyterianism, which I have not, knowing it so well as I do.

The great want in Scotland just now for Church people and Laity, is some book which gives *accurate* information as to the tenets of Presbyterians, pointing out where they err and how: it would do more for the Church there than any of the pet notions of giving up her Liturgy or any other pandering to the spirit of indifferentism.

Yours faithfully,
A SCOTCH LAYMAN.

P.S.—The point is pretty much this—Can Priests carry on Apostolical Succession? We say no! But let it be plainly proved.

JUNIOR CARLTON CLUB, S.W.
June 14th, 1868.

ORIGINAL POETRY.

THE PILGRIMS.

I and Sylvanus, companions dear to each other,
  Travelled together as pilgrims in quest of a city;
True to ourselves, truest to her whom both own as Mother,
  Heedless alike of the smiles of the world or its pity.

Thus journeying onward, one asked us where we were going,
  What was the City we longed for, its state and the name of its Master,
To whom we made answer, our staff and crucifix showing,
  The City of Peace, where Jesus is Monarch and Pastor.

Far o'er the mountains it lies, where the sunlight is dying,
  Far o'er those peaks which a mantle of purple is folding;
Immaculate Realm, where nevermore sorrow nor sighing
  Sadden the Feast which its denizens alway are holding.

What place must that be where strife never enters nor passion,
  Where all with one mouth and one song uplift their thanksgiving:
The face of whose Peace never alters, changes its fashion,
  But abides in that House of the Lord, one, everliving.

Travelling thus to the City whose walls are salvation,
  Whose portals are praise, whose peace is unbroken for ever,
Ours the death-prayer of Jesus, Peace for His sanctified Nation;
  Unity, this, in the face of the world, our endeavour.

Then said the stranger, "Your journey is long, and most dreary
  The valley ye enter, there, where the road makes a turning:
Enthusiasts now, how soon will your feet become weary,
  How soon will ye chill who now with such ardour are burning.

"You dream of an age, when the East and the West undivided,
  Abased in the dust, the world to the Church shall be kneeling:
When doubters and guessers at truth by her shall be guided
  In quietness into that Fold for which they are feeling.

"And schisms you say will be healed, and factions be broken,
  Forces of good will be quickened, Hell's kingdom be shaken;
The saints of the Lord be avenged, and many the token
  That Satan, dark prince of the world, a captive is taken.

"Beautiful picture ye draw, but how wildly ideal
Your views of the times, how foolish your fancied discerning
Of things that shall be upon earth; O dreamers, be real,
The needs of the world, your world that ye pray for, be learning!"

With such words he left us, calling us fools in his manner,
Wishing us well on our journey to peace and perfection:
His the maxims of this world, but we, sworn to Christ's banner,
Know whom we believe in, are sure of our lofty election.

Ah! so it must be, for how can the world learn our meaning,
Pray for the oneness of Christendom, rent and divided?
She whose wan hands, on a reed which shall pierce her is leaning,
Her strength, arm of flesh, her vision unture and one-sided.

Who shall convince thee, cold world, in thy selfishness lying?
Who shall redeem thee, so good as to need no salvation?
Who rise to save thee, proud world, in thy vanity dying,
Despising the sent of the Lord, disowning His nation?

* * * * *

The valley *was* dark, and as we went forward, benighted,
A crowd of unfaithful souls met us, cowed by affliction;
Souls who were turned from their purpose, heart-faint and affrighted,
To-morrow, they said, to-morrow, the flesh-crucifixion.

Others opined we were wanting in prudence, erratic,
These were the safe ones, whose praise in the Church,—Moderation:
Hare-brained they called us, un-English, and some, more emphatic,
Cursed in degrees, and the fiercer the higher their station.

So it went on year after year, and weary the waiting
For signs from the Lord that prayers of His faithful were heeded:
Eager the straining to see if the flood were abating,
As day after day, in faith was the Sacrifice pleaded.

Once as we entered a village the Church bells were ringing,
We answered their summons, and Evensong ended,
Came words upon peace in Christ's Church, and then with sweet singing,
These verses, which told how peace with the strife ever blended.

The sails are rent, the rudder fails,
  Our bark is cast on angry waves,
We plunge in darkness, tempest-tossed,
  And yet He sleeps Who saves.

What recks it though we strain each nerve
  And anxious watch each moment keep ?
All efforts fail whilst CHRIST our LORD
  Lies in the stern asleep.

Silence ! our craven hearts wax cold,
  Our hands are paralysed with fear ;
If hearts believe, and hands do work,
  Both find a Helper near.

Our utmost done, our utmost borne,
  We wake the Sleeper, and a balm
Flows for each fear, for JESUS speaks,
  And instantly is calm.

O Church of GOD, the Cross thy sign,
  Imperishable, stately bark,
Thy foes may see Thee tempest-tried,
  And driving in the dark ;

But they forget Who with thee sails,
  While waves break o'er and tempests strip ;
O foes without, O faint within,
  The CHRIST is in the ship.

We only have to ask His help,
  And having wrought and done His Will,
Come passion's blasts, or floods of hate,
  He speaks and all is still !

Then followed words still of peace, the good priest's benediction,
  Commending to God's gracious care the flock which he tended:
Souls whom he joyed with, or solaced in all their affliction,
  Counselled and guided, and cheered when the pilgrimage ended.

Peace of the Christ be upon us, though foes are assailing,
  And brothers start back from our side to stand in fresh places :
Peace, though Hell's gates 'gainst the city of God *seem* prevailing,
  And the world *seems* to quell the Spirit of God and His graces.

But ah! it is not so: for what though the worldling may jeer us,
And brethren desert us, One stands in our midst with His Blessing:
One mighty to save, in the thick of the battle is near us,
About us, within us, as closer each foeman is pressing.

One still to guide us, though long be the journey and dreary,
To the city at peace with herself, Christ her foundation:
Here the vigil and prayer, prayed till we well-nigh grow weary;
There, blessing of peace; yes, in thee, thou one, peaceful nation!

WM. CHATTERTON DIX.

LITERARY NOTICES.

We are indebted to Dr. Raphael Melia for a valuable treatise on the Blessed Virgin Mary—*The Woman Blessed by all Generations; or Mary, the Object of Veneration and Imitation to all Christians*, (London, Longmans.) If wanting in the exquisite grace of Dr. Newman's celebrated "Letter to Dr. Pusey on his recent Irenicon," in which the Anglican misconception of Roman doctrine as to the Immaculate Conception of our Lady was so ably exposed, it shows considerable learning, and is written with such moderation that there is but little to which a well-instructed English Churchman could take exception. The passages of Holy Scripture which bear upon the question are impartially examined. We think, however, that, without any damage to the argument, it might have been admitted that a slight reproof was conveyed in our Lord's answer to His Mother, when she reminded Him at the marriage at Cana of Galilee, that "they had no wine." This has been freely acknowledged by Roman Catholic writers. It will be sufficient to refer to the learned Patritius, who, in his Commentary on S. John's Gospel, observes:—"Non est dubitandum quin illud *Quid mihi et tibi?* increpationem aliquam querelæ admixtam exhibeat: is enim est ejus usus in Hebræorum sermone." Still, as Dr. Newman has pointed out, in saying "the hour was *not yet* come," our Blessed Lord "implied that the hour would come, when He would have to do with her, and she might ask and obtain from Him miracles. Accordingly, S. Augustine thinks that that hour had come, when on the cross He said, *Consummatum est*, and, after His ceremonial estrangement of some years, He recognised His Mother, and committed her to the care of the beloved disciple. Thus by marking out the beginning and the end of the period of exception, when she could not exert her influence upon Him, He signifies more clearly by the contrast, that her presence with Him, and her power was to be the rule." The graphotype illustrations from monuments found in the Catacombs, as well as from pictures, mosaics, sculptures, glasses, and cameos of the Ancient Church, with which the work is enriched, are of extreme value, and show in the most touching manner the high antiquity of devotion to the Blessed Virgin. The quotations from the Fathers are carefully selected. The translations, however, considering the freedom with which they are made, are occasionally bald; and, at times, the meaning of the original is obscured. Tertullian is not an easy author to translate; but we might fairly

have expected a more exact rendering of a passage from the *De Carne Christi* than is given at page 10. "Virgo erat adhuc terra, nondum opere compressa, nondum sementi subacta; ex ea hominem factum accepimus a Deo in animam vivam. Igitur si primus Adam de terra traditur, merito sequens vel novissimus Adam, ut Apostolus dixit, *proinde de terra, id est carne nondum generationi resignata, in spiritum vivificantem a Deo est prolatus.*" Dr. Melia's translation is:—"The earth was still virgin, not ploughed, nor sown, when man was taken from it by God, and became a living soul. If the first Adam was so taken from the earth, deservedly the following, or the new Adam, as He is called by the Apostle, *has been taken from the same earth, that is, from the virginal flesh in the spirit vivified.*" Not the least interesting part of the volume is the testimony of Anglican and Protestant writers—the former ought not to be confounded with the latter—to the incommunicable privileges and august prerogatives of the Virgin Mother. It fully confirms the position assumed in the article on "The Blessed Virgin Mary," which appeared in the May number of this REVIEW. The *imprimatur* of the Archbishop of Westminster is a guarantee of the strictest orthodoxy, from an Ultramontane point of view, of Dr. Melia's Treatise. And we are happy to be able to witness to the correctness of the learned author's remarks in the Introduction:—"The reader of this work will not find the Virgin Mary held up as one to be worshipped like a Deity: neither will he find her considered as the source of grace, nor as having by her merits rescued fallen man from eternal damnation; nor as knowing our wants, or hearing our prayers by her own exclusive power; nor will he learn that the Sacrifice of the Altar should be offered to her, or that any of God's attributes should be ascribed to her. No such assumptions will be found in the work. The reader will see that the Blessed Virgin Mary, although endowed with the highest heavenly gifts, and raised to the most exalted dignity that a creature can attain, is yet a pure creature of Almighty God; and as such is attributed to her by the Catholic Church, only what a superlatively privileged creature could effectually receive from that Omnipotent and loving God, to render her worthy to be the Mother of His Only-begotten Son." It is most refreshing to find that the doctrinal differences which separate the Roman and Anglican Communions disappear when viewed in the light of unimpassioned inquiry. Amidst so much that is excellent, we cannot but regret that a work, so valuable in itself, should occasionally be disfigured by such passages as the following:—"As no Church may claim the right of being called the *true Church of Christ*, and to have the title or epithet of *Catholic*, except the *Church of Rome*, as has been fully proved before, it follows that out of the Communion of the Church of

Rome salvation is not to be hoped for by those who by a *culpable* ignorance, or *malâ fide*, are separated from it." Indeed! We will merely observe that we have searched in vain for any *proof* of so monstrous an assertion. Such blemishes—and they are few in number—should be removed in a second edition. Dr. Melia's volume deserves a place in every Clergyman's library.

The Church in the Army. A Letter to the Right Honourable Sir J. S. Pakington, Secretary of State for War. By an Officer. With Appendix, &c., (London: Bartlett,) exposes a sad state of things in the Army, of which we, outside, have very little notion. "An Officer" comes forward to claim for the Chaplains of the Church the like liberties enjoyed by the Roman Catholics and Presbyterians. It seems there has been issued a certain Address from the Chaplain General, in which Chaplains are very plainly told that their first duty is to the Commanding Officer, their second to the prejudices of Presbyterians, without any mention of duty to God. "The attempt," says the 'Officer,' "therefore, is made, and the theory on which that attempt rests is here plainly enunciated, to constitute the Church of England a merely subsidiary part of the 'Discipline of the Army.'" In fact, by this "Address," each Commanding Officer is made a lay-pope, whether he be a Churchman, Roman Catholic, or Presbyterian. The Address lays down this. The Chaplains are to "do nothing without the concurrence of the Commanding Officer." Whatever the orders of the Commanding Officer may be, even though they should be such as the Chaplain cannot conscientiously obey, they must still be carried out by the minister of God and of the Church, who is thus delivered over, bound hand and foot, into the power of the secular authority." In a note we read, "Mr. Gleig says that, if any Chaplain is proved to him (Mr. Gleig) to have disobeyed his or a Commanding Officer's orders, he will recommend the immediate and summary dismissal from the service of the offender. He adds that the Secretary for War and the Commander-in-Chief have promised to act upon that recommendation." Such a state of things as this calls for public exposure. Whether the Bill now before Parliament, which puts Chaplains in garrisons to some extent under the Bishop of the Diocese where the garrison is situate, will do anything to alleviate this shameful state of things, we do not know: we are quite sure the matter requires looking into. The result of this making the religion of the Church of England into a department of the Army is, as stated in this "letter," that soldiers who have any desire to become religious are so disgusted with the Church, as thus administered, that they become Wesleyans or Plymouth Brethren. Dr. Bull, a Wesleyan, stated at the last year's Conference that the Wesleyans were increasing in the Army at

the rate of 1,000 annually. And even this is supposed to be under the mark.

From a perusal of "*The English Church Union*" *a Ritualistic Society: proved and illustrated in a series of letters originally published in the* "*Rock*" *newspaper*, (London: Hatchard,) we learn that Dean Close is grieved at the fact that a Branch of the E.C.U. is established in the Protestant Diocese of Carlisle. So he writes these letters to stir up the Protestant spirit against the Union. This he does by bringing the old cry of Popery. Dean Close is not the oracle he once was; and the cry of Popery has lost much of its terror.

The Resurrections of the Truth, (London: Rivingtons,) a Sermon preached in the Church of S. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, on S. Mark's Day, being the day of laying the first stone of Keble College, by the Bishop of Oxford, is a powerful sermon, with its subject well expressed and ably drawn out. We give one extract, "For there are still, as of old, dark and troublous days, when the bands of the Moabites invade the land at the coming in of the year, when the free-thinker, and the doubter, and the neologian, and the carping critic, and the half-wise philosopher, come up in companies by the way of the Dead Sea from the high places of their Moab; and still at such times, from the desire of seeming liberal, and free from narrow prejudice, or to escape the trouble of controversy, men are for burying hastily with cold compromise, and scarcely decent reverence, some great truth or other, because amidst the opposition of men it seems inconvenient and ill-suited to these times, and, so far as any good is to come of it, indeed dead; and so they thrust in their spade into one of these prophets' graves; speaking of it as that which befitted his age, but which theirs had outgrown. [A sentence fourteen lines long!] And lo! even as they thus babble their inaptitudes, the very memory of the mighty dead rebukes sternly their short-sighted timidity, the half-buried verity awakes again as from a swoon, Elisha's bones still do their work of marvel, and, to their wondering consternation, the old truth revives, and stands upon its feet before them all."

Ritualism: or a Philosophic Study on Religious Worship and Ceremonies. Adapted from the French of M. Auguste Nicolas. By a Priest of the Diocese of Exeter. (London: Hayes,) is a most valuable compendium, and should be put into the hands of all educated persons who have a prejudice against high Ritual. Entering upon an examination of the rationale of Ritualism, it shows how the latter tends to the honour of God, as well as assists the devotions of the worshipper. "The Beautiful is the lustre of the True," are the opening words. "The point in question is not the wants of the Deity in reli-

gion, but the wants and duties of man." "Religion, in fact, is composed of two orders of relations—the one by which God descends to us; the other, by which we raise ourselves to Him. The first ought clearly to be the basis of the second. Now the first, even in nature, are clothed with sensible forms. It is only through His works that God appears to us; He has made the universe as it were a Temple, wherein His invisible perfections are expressed *visibly*. Why should we now reverse this order and liberate ourselves, in replying to Him, from the law to which He, in some sort, submitted Himself to speak to us?" Thus a French Protestant theologian priest very well remarks: —"I do not understand anything about the vague and indiscernible deity of the poet Lamartine: he has no feet that I can bathe with my tears, or knees that I can embrace, or eyes wherein I can read my pardon, or mouth which can pronounce it: he is not a man and I have need of a God-man." "Christianity is the restoration of human nature by Christ. Everything which enters into human nature, and everything which is connected with it, ought to participate by way of consequence in this restoration." "Look at the Magdalen; divine love has penetrated her soul. What is immediately passing (happening, taking place) within her? Does she confine herself in expressing this love '*in spirit and in truth*,' to loving mentally? Oh no! she runs, she seeks her Saviour, and as soon as she sees Him, she throws herself at His feet; falling down at His feet in tears she embraces them. . . . Nay, she does more; an elaborate box of ointment, very costly. . . . it is about to be broken as her heart, to be poured out as her tears." These short extracts will give a sample of the rest of the book.

Dr. T. W. Peile has sent us two sermons, 1, "*One Bread, One Body;*" *what under this view we offer and present unto God in the Lord's Supper, argued from the Bible and Prayer Book only.* (London: Rivingtons.) 2. *The Presentation of Christ in the Temple.* Dr. Peile is a Greek scholar, and seems to imagine that the Faith of Christ is to be discovered by applying the rules of criticism to the text of the New Testament. Accordingly we have these rules of criticism applied to 1 Cor. x. 17. Dr. Peile, in following out this plan, quietly rejects as spurious—on the authority of Dean Alford—such words as tell against his theory; and then proceeds to reject the Church's doctrine of the Real Presence! Under this process what article of our faith can stand? It is convenient to ignore also the fact that the Church has and has had a teaching on the Holy Eucharist antecedent to, and independent of, the letter of the New Testament. Again, what can be more demoralising to the mind of any man, than for one who has declared that he considered himself "called according to the Will of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . to the Order of Priesthood," to deny the fact of his being a priest?

who has had said to him those awful words, "Recieve the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest," and yet can get into the pulpit of his Church, and declare the priesthood a fiction? We use the word "demoralising" advisedly, for we believe that it is impossible for any one to say what Dr. Peile has said in this sermon, and keep a right judgment in things pertaining to God: the habit of mind which can trifle with the most solemn engagements, and deny the most awful words, is one which has already prepared itself to receive and entertain any kind of error or falsehood congenial to itself. To understand this better let us compare the obligations of one Sacrament with those of another, the Sacrament of Matrimony with that of Orders; suppose some one anxious to show his independence of the obligations of matrimony, as Dr. Peile is of those of his ordination, and even to assert his right to keep as many concubines as he pleased; would not all condemn that man as thoroughly immoral and depraved? Why not then say the like of holy orders? The second sermon, eminently common-place and superficial, does not call for any other special remark.

The Divided House; a sermon, by Mr. C. R. Tollemache, London: Parker), is, we fear, in bad taste, and not historically accurate. It does not follow because the Celtic Church, at the time of the Mission of S. Augustine, did not recognise the Primacy of Rome, that therefore the Church of England at the present day is not bound to acknowledge it; any more than that common assertion of the Roman Catholics, that because S. Augustine was sent by Pope Gregory, therefore Canterbury must always acknowledge the Supremacy. Nor is it historically true that S. Augustine "signalised his mission by conniving at the murder of twelve hundred British monks." The massacre of Bangor took place many years after the death of S. Augustine, as Mr. Tollemache ought to have known. These kind of sermons completely defeat the aims of their authors, and had better neither be preached nor published.

The Ignorance of foolish Men, and how to meet it, (London: Masters), is an excellent sermon, which we can recommend for distribution.

The Baptism of Christ by S. John, considered with respect to Infant Baptism and its Administration. A Sermon by the Rev. O. B. Tyler (London: Church Press Company), 1868, is well-intentioned, but wanting in theological knowledge. The writer does not seem to have mastered the doctrine laid down by S. Paul that "there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit;" otherwise he could not have given the exceedingly weak answer he has to the question, "Why were they who had already received the Holy Ghost afterwards baptised?"

The Attraction of Jesus Christ Crucified, by Mr. Liddon, preached in S. Paul's Cathedral, at the Special Evening Service on Good Friday, 1868 (London: Rivingtons), having rivetted the attention of such a various multitude as that which assembles in S. Paul's Cathedral at the Special Services, for upwards of an hour, must be one of unusual power and earnestness, and so it is: moreover it is one, in which the power is felt as much in reading it as in hearing it. In the limited space at our command, we cannot make quotations of sufficient length to give even a sample of the preacher's style and matter. We therefore recommend it to our readers, not to be read only, but *to be studied.*

What are the True Principles and Doctrines of the Church of England? A Lecture, delivered at the Music Hall, Swansea (London: Palmer), is an excellent lecture, clearly and forcibly written, making an excellent tract for distribution where ignorance of Church principles prevails.

Church-Rate Legislation: a Letter to the Right Hon. Gathorne Hardy; by William Longman and Frederic Burn Harvey, Churchwardens of Berkhampstead (London: Longmans), is a valuable and interesting pamphlet. The various Bills before Parliament to settle this much-vexed question are briefly examined in this letter. That of Mr. Newdegate, to make the Church-rate directly a charge upon the land, and not indirectly, as it is now; that is, that the landlord should pay and not the tenant, is the plan that these gentlemen think to be most equitable: but experience warns them that it is now impracticable. They therefore propose that there should be a compulsory Fabric Rate, and leave all the rest to be provided for by voluntary means. But would this plan really *settle* the question? Would there not be as much contention, strife, and litigation about a Fabric Rate, as there is now? Have not political dissenters quite as great a prejudice against maintaining the fabric of a church as to washing the surplice? Besides, would not the *compulsory* clause lead in the end to our churches becoming Government property, and ceasing to be parochial? The temper of the House of Commons is to get rid of anything compulsory in any shape.

Sir Robert Phillimore, D.C.L., Dean of Arches, against the Lord Bishop of London (London: Pickering), is a clever application of the judgment of the Dean of Arches to the constant habit of bishops in their manner of performing the Rite of Confirmation. The writer shows that, according to the judgment of the Dean of Arches on a *Rite* and a *Ceremony*, in which Mr. Mackonochie was condemned, the Bishop of London, and indeed all the bishops, should be condemned for their altering

the *ceremonies* at Confirmation. We fear bishops are too pachydermatous to be wounded by this arrow.

Some people are subject to mild crazes on certain points. Mr. Rochfort Clarke, the other day, writes a *Letter* to the Rector of S. Martin's-in-the-Fields, to denounce painted windows, and to declare his adhesion to the literal meaning of the Second Commandment. Why does he not close his offices, and refuse to do business on Saturdays, according to the literal command of the Fourth ?

Mr. Sillen, in his tract on *Usury*, (London, E. Wilson), has an equal craze about usury. His case is very much stronger than Mr. Clarke's, for in addition to the Old Testament he can cite numerous canons, all denouncing the practice, whereas Mr. Clarke can quote nothing better than the Homily on the "Peril of Idolatry." Usury, however, *pur et simple*, is not forbidden in the Old Testament, but only taking usury by Israelites of one another : they were allowed to take what they liked of strangers. In the middle ages, when property was unsafe, and principles of trade not understood, usury was equally unjust, oppressive, and therefore to be condemned. It is not sinful in itself, but in its abuse, and in its strong temptation to oppression and wrong.

We much wish that the picture of freedom and absence from State control which Mr. Lindsay, in his *Address delivered before the Church Union, Scotland, at the First Annual Meeting, held at Aberdeen, on the 22nd October*, 1867, (Aberdeen : Brown), so graphically draws, as the heritage of the Scottish Church, were realised in action. He contrasts the position of the Church of England, as the "bond-slave of the State," with the liberty of the Church of Scotland ; the Bishops who are "mere nominees of the Crown," with the freedom of election in the North : but surely he forgets that there may be other bondages and restraints as withering in their influence : and we can speak from experience, that the bondage to half Presbyterian Lairds is more blighting and more galling than anything we suffer from the State. Are the free-elected Bishops of Scotland so very much superior to the State nominees of England ? Too many Anglicans, High Church Anglicans, in judging of Scotch "freedom from State tyranny," look through Bishop Forbes' spectacles—the glass in which is *coleur de rose*.

The Plain Guide (London : Masters), has deservedly reached a third edition. It is a most admirable manual.

Songs of Joy (London : Rivingtons), written with taste and some poetical feeling, is an appropriate book of original verses for children.

Recent Secessions and Corporate Re-union (London : Burns), 1868.

is a production which at least indicates the growth of a school amongst the Roman Catholics fully appreciating the great religious Revival in the Church of England, and can write of it with fairness and charity.

Mr. Edward Husband's four sermons, *The Battle of the Faith* (London: Palmer), as regards their doctrine, are unquestionably orthodox and Catholic. Some of their statements, however, are a little crude and not put exactly in a way calculated to win over the doubtful. Still their style, though somewhat abrupt, is vigorous, original, and forcible, while they are exceedingly readable and attractive. That on the Re-union of Christendom is the best.

The Gate of Paradise; a Dream of Easter Eve (London: Rivingtons), is a pleasant allegory, too short by far, and too imperfectly worked out. It has, however, grace and good taste on every page.

Mr. A. M. Morgan's sermon, preached at All Saints', Lambeth, *Prevailing Intercession* (London: Parkers), is a vigorous composition, written in forcible and scholarly language, and is rife with Catholic truth and practical piety.

Dr. A. T. Lee's *Tract regarding the present state of the Church of Ireland* (London: Rivingtons), a pamphlet in its forty-sixth thousand, should be read by all politicians and churchmen who maintain, as we do, that the eighth commandment is still in force, and that to rob a corporation, capable of legally holding property, is equally a sin as to rob a private person. If Church property in Ireland be taken by the State, the Russells and the Bedfords ought to be made to disgorge their spoils of the so-called "Reformation." Perhaps we may live to see this. God grant it! Amen.

A useful manual is Mr. T. J. Bailey's *English Orders and Papal Supremacy* (London: Parkers), comprising as it does in a few pages the leading facts upon which the validity of Anglican ordinations rests. The book is compiled with clearness and care, and will be acceptable to many. We observe with regret however, that Dr. Pusey's mistake about the form adopted in Parker's consecration being the same as that used in the consecration of Chicheley, is repeated, with no reference to the Doctor's withdrawal and correction of it; and, moreover, that our great *crux*—sufficient reasons for altering the Sarum Ordinal—is wholly unconsidered.

A second edition of Mr. George Huntington's *Sermons* (London: Parkers), is just out. Extremely well written, sound and solid both in their theological statements and hortatory passages, they are rendered additionally interesting by the appropriate application of the Catholic faith and practices to the needs of the present day.

Lady Herbert's new book, *Abyssinia and its Apostle* (London: Burns), is a charming volume, written with considerable power and most perfect taste. Treating as it does a history and a subject of which little is known, it will be very acceptable and instructive to a large class of readers.

A most admirable publication has just been issued by Mowbray of Oxford, *The Order for the Communion of the Sick, with Notes and Directions.* As a practical help for clergy who desire to celebrate and administer the Holy Mysteries with reverence and care, we know of no volume likely to serve their purpose better. All the directions are full and lucid, while the author's own valuable dissertations are evidently the work of one who writes from experience and who writes *con amore.* The Order for Unction from Edward's First Prayer Book added, is we believe now very widely re-adopted. Thus an Apostolic and Scriptural rite is being restored.

A seventh edition of Mr. Fosberry's *Hymns and Poems for the Sick and Suffering*, (London: Rivingtons), has just been issued, at a very reasonable price. It is a standard work, evidently well appreciated by the public.

Mr. G. R. Prynne's *Hints on the Management of Sunday Schools*, (London: Hayes), is an admirable book, thoroughly practical, and full of the wisest suggestions from an experienced authority.

Maximilian, and other Poems, by Mr. J. C. Earle, (London: Burns), published in aid of S. Vincent's Home for Destitute Boys, is a most charming and attractive volume, full of true poetry, expressed in elegant language both with grace and power. It is with sincere regret that we omit some extracts we had marked for quotation, of singular beauty. So that all we can do is to recommend our readers to procure this tasteful volume for themselves. It is issued at a reasonable cost, and deserves a wide circulation.

Mr. Prebendary Pye's *Four Sermons on the Christian Sacrifice*, (Oxford: Mowbray), are distinguished for their outspoken plainness of speech. Not, however, that they are at all wanting in accurate theology, sound reasoning, or practical suggestions—far otherwise. We are glad to see, too, that a dignitary of the Church openly advocates the restoration of the word "Mass." All that is Catholic and useful in promoting Corporate Re-union ought to be advocated, and should be proclaimed on the housetops.

Father Sarra's *Doctrine of Indulgences* has been issued in English by Mr. Ambrose St. John, of the Oratory, and published by Burns. Protestants may here discover, if they choose to take the trouble, that their many misconceptions of *Roman*

Catholic practices arise mainly from their own innate ignorance and perverse malice. On the other hand, Father Sarra fails to meet certain objections of some weight, propounded by theologians of his own portion of the Christian Family—more especially those of Oriental divines.

Dr. Maturin's Sermon, *Unfaithfulness the True Source of the Church's Danger*, (Dublin: Ponsonby), is a most outspoken but exceedingly charitable comment on Irish Orangeism. As the leader of the Catholics of the sister isle he will be listened to with attention. We cannot here forbear to notice how extremely ungenerous the High Church Radicals are to our Irish fellow-churchmen. England, though quite as dead forty years ago, has risen to the work of restoration—why, then, should we give the cold shoulder to those of our Irish brethren who are so anxious to follow our example?

Mr. Edward Harston's *Parish Recollections*, (London: Palmer), consists of twenty short sermons preached by him during his connection with Sherborne. Vigorous, attractive, interesting, and eminently practical, they are all worthy of an attentive perusal. Now he has been driven away by the active opposition of ignorant and self-willed men, the faithful are enabled to gauge the loss they have sustained by his resignation. His book is a very pleasing volume, which we hope may have a large circulation.

The first volume of Mr. Wilkinson's *Daily Readings* (London: Hayes), is completed, and a very excellent volume it is both for family reading and private consideration.

A fourth edition of Dr. Newman's charming and beautiful book *The Church of the Fathers*, has just been issued by Messrs. Burns and Co. When we remember for how long a period this volume was out of print and how great and general were the demands for it, we need do no more than indicate to our readers the present issue.

Choice Notes on the Gospel of S. Matthew (London: Macmillan), are drawn from all sides and sources, on an exceedingly eclectic principle. The result is somewhat of a jumble, in which —if Orthodoxy has a voice—other 'doxies have a hearing likewise. The compiler, we observe, holds the singular Broad Church view that everlasting does not mean "lasting for ever," and so splits hairs with great tact and ability. On the other hand, most of the "Notes" are full of piety, learning, suggestive hints, and true devotion.

Story of the Kings of Judah and Israel, written for Children, by A. O. B. (Edinburgh: W. P. Nimmo), is an attractively-bound book with a coloured frontispiece. Further than this we have

little to say in its praise, objecting strongly as we do to the irreverent practice of using familiar phrases and expressions in place of the plain letter of Holy Scripture, and telling Bible stories, "as you speak to each other, or as Mama speaks when telling you one of Hans Andersen's or Kingsley's pretty Fairy Tales." Children thus taught to regard the Bible as a mere book of stories or history, will be in danger of losing all reverence for, and faith in, the inspired Word of God.

A small volume of *Devotional Readings*—well printed and substantially bound—being *Select passages from the Sermons of Henry Edward Manning* (Hodges), is a valuable addition to our stock of spiritual books. To the many who have not those remarkable Sermons within their reach, this well-judged selection from their pages will be specially welcome.

In *The Monthly Packet* for June (Mozleys), Mr. Louis Coutier Biggs's papers on *English Hymnology* are brought to a satisfactory conclusion, as well as *The Fairy of Sands*, a vigorous tale, translated with much spirit and ability from the French of Paul Feval. An interesting account of *A day in Spitalfields and St. George's in the East*, is worth reading, being a glimpse at life in the slums of London.

Origin and Progress of Religious Orders; and Happiness of a Religious State, by Pattrick Mannock (Preston: H. Thomson), is a work of much interest, and though written in a quaint style, cannot fail to prove useful and instructive. It is chiefly a reprint from a "learned and approved work, written in Latin by Father Jerome Platus, S.J., and published in English in 1632." The original being very rare, the present publication will be the more welcome and acceptable to many.

A new edition of *The Day Hours of the Church of England*, (London: Masters), carefully revised and rendered so practically easy in use by some slight re-arrangement of its plan, suffices to assure us that its gained and recognised position will not soon be occupied by any other similar book. It is *the* manual of community devotions which will be used throughout the Church of England, and being published, well bound in cloth, for two shillings, cannot fail of being acceptable to thousands. Such a re-issue tells eloquently of the steady advance of the Catholic Revival.

From our publisher, Mr. Hayes, independent of those of his books elsewhere noticed, we have received the following: 1. *The Christian Warfare*, by Mr. Eliot, of Pau, two thoughtful and impressive sermons on some Lessons learnt from our Blessed Lord's life. 2. *The Daily Celebration of the Holy Communion*, a Sermon by Mr. Liddell, of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, preached on the restoration of the Daily Sacrifice there, full of pertinent reasonings, well calculated to influence for good those who

heard it. 3. A third edition of Mr. Bennett's *Letter to Dr. Pusey*, which contains those proper explanations regarding his previous words, which we felt quite confident would be forthcoming. Few persons can read this masterly manifesto (which we recommend all to obtain, now they can do so for a shilling), without feeling how great the loss is to the Church in London of Mr. Bennett's withdrawal. He is a man of great power and determination, and well calculated to be a leader amongst those whose perplexed leaders sometimes lead them into dangerous places. 4. A third edition of *The Prayer Book for the Young*, printed on thin paper and well bound, which will be found both convenient and compendious, not only for children but for grown-up persons also. 5. A volume of *Sermons, Parochial and Occasional*, by the Rev. Dr. F. G. Lee; and 6, that exceedingly important and valuable treatise translated into English, of S. Thomas Aquinas *On the Incarnation*. We have little hesitation in maintaining that this is one of the most practically useful theological books issued for many a day. Full of that divine wisdom and human learning for which the great Doctor of the West was so renowned, it is a book which should be possessed by all clerics who desire to write and preach with exactness on the high and mysterious subject of God manifest in the Flesh. We shall refer to this book on a future occasion.

Two volumes of the new edition of Dr. Newman's *Sermons*, (London: Rivingtons), have just been issued, under the Editorship of Mr. Copeland. They will be acceptable to many, and should be obtained by every clergyman who does not already possess them, as perhaps the most important work in having deepened and strengthened the foundations of the great Oxford Catholic Revival of 1832.

The first volume, which is just out, of Mr. Bennett's *Romanism*, forming part of the series, *The Church's Broken Unity* (Hayes), is principally occupied with the question of the Papal Supremacy, and, indeed, very properly so, as this is by far the most important question between ourselves and the members of the Roman Communion. The original independence of the Church in these islands, of the See of Rome, is shown with great plainness and perspicuity: and passages from Holy Scripture and the writings of the Fathers, with many events in Ecclesiastical History, are brought forward with great ability, learning, and fairness, to show the inconsistency of the pretensions which have been put forth, especially by Ultramontanes, in behalf of the Supremacy of that See, the *Primacy* of which is not denied. The proceedings of the "Reformation" are scarcely touched upon, but we suppose that that and other subjects will be discussed in the concluding volume. We have heard a wish expressed that Mr. Bennett had entitled his work,

On Roman Catholicism, instead of *Romanism*, as our friends of the Roman communion object to the latter word as a nickname. We are sure, however, that the excellent author meant nothing offensive by it; and with every disposition to conciliate, we scarcely see how, from his point of view, it could have been properly used, inasmuch as he was treating *exclusively* of those parts of the Roman Catholic system which he regarded as not *Catholic* but simply *Roman*. We need scarcely say that throughout the volume there is nothing calculated to wound the feelings of the most sensitive member of the Roman Catholic Church.

Four numbers of Mr. Hodges's new series of *Sunday Stories for the Christian Year* have reached us, which are interesting, and bring out plainly the Church's teaching in the Sunday Services. They are well adapted for reading in school classes, or for lending libraries.

The Dictation Prize, the June number of *Our Curate's Budget*, (Hodges), is a very good story, suitable for school boys.

The Messrs. Parker have just issued a sixpenny edition, well and clearly printed, of Scupoli's *Spiritual Combat*. This makes the tenth thousand circulated of Dr. Pusey's translation, a sure sign of true progress. The publishers deserve every commendation for having produced such a marvel of excellence at so small a cost.

The issue of a new and revised edition, handsomely printed and well got up, of *The People's Hymnal*, (London: Masters), reminds us that we owe an apology to its compilers for not having yet reviewed it. A paper on several modern Hymnals is ready, which we hope will appear in our present volume. In the meantime we welcome "The People's Hymnal" as a most valuable contribution to the work of re-Catholicising the people of England.

Mr. James Rumsey's address on *Oxford Extension*, (London: Parkers), delivered before the Social Science Congress at Manchester, is a thoughtful and practical essay from an experienced hand. That "Extension must be free and self-supporting" is no doubt what all would wish, but we doubt its practicability. If the Whigs and Radicals had not "reformed" Oxford for the sake of certain hungry professors, their tools, extension, on the old and sound basis, would have been less a failure than the "liberal" nostrums of later years.

Three more parts of the late Mr. Keble's *Sermons, Occasional and Parochial*, (London: Parkers), have been issued,—most acceptable to a large class of his sincerest admirers.

Mr. Moultrie's paper on *Family Prayer*, (London: Masters), a lucid and learned dissertation on a difficult subject, should

be read with care both by the clergy and heads of families. Its suggestions are valuable, and its teaching just what we all need to know.

Archdeacon Rose, in his *Sermon* preached at Great S. Mary's, Cambridge, (London: Parkers), answers one portion of the reasoning of "Ecce Homo" with temperate language and convincing arguments. He deals with the subject by maintaining a principle, and those who maintain principles are to be respected, more especially, as in this case, when they are sound and good.

Mr. Carter's Sermon preached at the Consecration of the Bishop of Gibraltar (Dr. Harris), *S. John the Teacher of these Latter Days*, (London: Masters), is full of wisdom and charity. It depicts with exactness the duties of an Anglican Bishop of Gibraltar, and points out how great a work a really good and devout Catholic may effect in healing the breaches of Zion.

The Bishop of Ely's Sermon, *The Retrospect of Forty Years*, (London: Longmans), is happily free from those notorious eccentricities which disfigure his book on the Articles. On the contrary, the sermon is not only forcible and eloquent, but sound and safe.

The Organic Unity of the Christian Church (Aberdeen: Davidson), by the Rev. W. P. Smith, a Free Church minister, is a thoughtful and earnest discourse, well written and fairly reasoned, which shows that the great Re-union movement is influencing the religious communities which lie around the Church of England. It will well repay perusal, though the *whole* truth is not adequately stated.

Mr. J. E. Vaux's admirable sermon, *The Souls of the Faithful Dead* (London: Simpkins), sets forth the truth of the Gospel on the pious practice of prayer for the departed with great clearness, much charity, and complete success.

A Speech by the late venerated Bishop Jebb, delivered in the House of Lords forty-four years ago, has been wisely re-published by his nephew, and can be had of Macintosh, Paternoster Row. It contains by far the best and most convincing arguments in favour of the Irish Established Church that we have come across, and should be widely circulated at the present crisis.

Mr. David Urquhart's pamphlet, *Appeal of a Protestant to the Pope to restore the Law of Nations* (London: Diplomatic Review Office), is a very remarkable production, well deserving of study. Whatever may be thought of the writer's "views," at least all must allow his considerable knowledge of foreign affairs, and the earnest sincerity of his appeal. Such an appeal is a sign of the times, and a testimony to the less bitter spirit which, as regards the Holy Father, is so happily prevailing.

Dr. Littledale's small manual, *The Children's Bread* (London: Palmer), a communion book for the young, deserves commendation. The short Hymns are excellent, both for their plainness of Catholic teaching and simplicity of diction. So, too, are the prayers. A series of good woodcuts, illustrating the various steps in the Holy Sacrifice, however, would be a great and attractive improvement.

A sermon, *Is there not a cause?* preached at SS. Peter and Paul's, Streatham, in defence of the Irish Church, otherwise excellent, is so disfigured by dashes (*sic*—), inverted commas, italics, and small capitals, as to be almost unreadable. Such eccentricities are un-masculine and pedantic. We quote one paragraph just as it stands:—As a Christian Country we exist—in God's sight as such—simply and solely because "the State" has *joined itself* on to the "Church of CHRIST," and *maintains it;* i.e. *defends* it. A State which does not *associate* itself unto the Church of CHRIST, and support it, is *not a Christian State.* The Church is to the State what a conscience is to an individual,—the *religious sanctifying element of its existence:* and, such being the case, it must "*defend* the "Faith:" and so that Faith, in return, becomes the "Defence of the State!" A professedly Christian country, then, *cannot* consent to *disestablish* the Church in any portion of its dominions proper, without assenting at the same time to the denial of CHRIST. It then becomes a country *a Theos!* The State is *un-Christianized!* "Is there not a Cause," then, for which we are called upon as Christians to "contend" now?

A very thoughtful and suggestive Sermon is that by Mr. R. W. Church, *Civilization and Religion*, (London: Parkers), preached before the University of Oxford. It treats a wide and deep subject in a spirit of faith and sound philosophy; and yet with a practical bearing highly to be valued and commended. One paragraph we give in its entirety:—

"Once more; we think much of purity, with all its consequences; that idea and family of thoughts, which is perhaps the most characteristic distinction between the old world of morality and feeling and the new; that idea, which, in its essential nature, apart from political necessities, or ceremonial restrictions, or social expediences or tastes, we owe absolutely to the religion of the Bible; which had its birth for us in that wonderful mixture of severity with tenderness, of inexorable and exacting holiness, with boundless pity for the sinner, tolerance for the weak, and welcome for the penitent, which marked the Son of Man; that most mysterious of the virtues, as its opposite is the most mysterious of the sins, which we have not yet found the way to talk much about, without danger to that which we most wish to guard. It is the flower of the Christian graces: witnessed by the care with which it has been fostered

from the first; witnessed, alas! in other and sadder ways, in the mistaken and wild expedients to cherish it, in the monstrous machinery brought into action to make up for the sluggishness or perversions of conscience, in the very magnitude of the scandals and shame inflicted on the Church, when the avowed ideal has cast a deeper shade on the bad and apostate life. The Christian idea of purity has still a hold on our society; imperfectly enough; but who can tell what it contributes to the peace, and grace, and charm, of what is so large a part of our earthly happiness? Can we ask a more anxious question than whether this hold will continue? No one can help seeing, I think, many ugly symptoms; the language of revolt is hardly muttered; the ideas of purity which we have inherited and thought sacred are boldly made the note and reproach of "the Christians." And—vital question as it is, one which, if solved in the wrong way, must, it is evident in the long run, be ruinous to society—yet there is no point of morality on which it is easier to sophisticate and confuse, easier to raise doubts of which it is hard to find the bottom, or to make restraints seem the unwarrantable bonds of convention and caprice. It is eminently one of those things, as to which we feel it to be absolutely the law of our being as long as we obey, but lose the feeling when we do not obey. Civilization in this matter, is by itself a very precarious safeguard for any sacred interests. By itself, it throws itself upon nature, and in some of its leading and most powerful representatives, looks back to paganism. It goes along with Christianity as to justice and humanity; but in the interest of individual liberty it parts company here. What trenches on and endangers ideas of purity, it may disapprove, but it declines to condemn or brand. At least, it does not condemn, it does not affect to condemn, in the sense in which religion condemns; in the sense in which, *with* religion, it condemns injustice, cruelty, and falsehood. It is too much to hope that civilization by itself will adopt and protect these ideas. And the passions which assail them are not among those which wear out with civilization and tend to extinction; they are constant forces, and as powerful as they are constant. Argument is hardly a match for them. They are only to be matched successfully by a rival ideal, a rival fire, the strength of a rival spring of feeling with its attractions and antipathies, a living law and instinct of the soul. Civilization supplies none such but what it owes to Christianity. Purity is one of those things which Christian ideas and influences produced; it is a thing which they alone can save."

The Rector of Crawley, Mr. Soper, has published a vigorous Sermon entitled a *Song of the Vineyard*, (London: Rivingtons). Though it does not in all points exactly harmonize either with

our view of the position of the Anglican communion, or with our estimate of the Reformation, for we think the writer eminently unjust to King Charles I., our "martyr monarch," yet it is based on a sound principle, and the following paragraph deserves special consideration:—

"And now regard, secondly, the effect of this among us here in England. Things might remain for a while very much as they are now. We might not live to see it—though, in the hasty strides by which revolutionary principles are advancing now, even this is very doubtful—but our children would live to see the endowments of religion swept away, no provision for the ministers of Christ beyond the people's voluntary gifts, and therefore no resident clergy in the villages where the population was mostly poor, and so the more in need of their ministrations; the churches used alternately by conflicting sects and parties, and so the doctrine preached in the morning flatly contradicted in the evening; the fabrics themselves either falling into decay or upheld by a new form of churchrate, which now there is so wild an outcry raised against. Then we should find the clergy, where they might chance to find a maintenance and to settle among a people, not bound, as they are now, to minister to all alike, whether sick or well, within a certain prescribed limit which we call a parish, but recognising only the claim of their own peculiar congregation—a claim which would either dwindle down to the mere public ministrations, or else would depend on self-interest, as in the case of any other merely secular profession. Again, I say, are we prepared for this?"

Archdeacon Clerke's *Charge containing suggestions as to the Care of Churchyards* (London: Parker), is a most useful and practical production. The tone of it throughout is most admirable, while its specific suggestions evidence such foresight and experience that we reprint the following as a fair and good specimen:—

"There existed from the first, or at least from an early date, an allowed custom of burying some bodies of Christains within the walls of the churches. When the monks and priests began to offer for the dead, they urged that there might be granted a liberty of sepulture within the churches where the masses for the dead were to be said. Pope Gregory listened to the request, and allowed that when the deceased had been absolved, and was not burdened with heavy sins, it might be a benefit to him to be buried in the church, because the friends and relations as often as they came within the church, seeing the grave, might remember the deceased, and pray to God for him. We need not question but that this was the origin of burials in churches, a custom so objectionable that I firmly trust that it has been altogether abandoned by us. Indeed, remonstrances were made against it soon after its introduction into England, and

so great and so numerous were the objections found against the continuance of this practice of burials in churches, that the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cuthbert, about the year 750, urged strongly the burials without, and not within the churches; that is to say, in the vacant spaces round the churches. To him, therefore, at that early date, we are indebted for the origin of our setting apart and consecrating churchyards as places of burial in this country. Two reflections seem to follow from these remarks, very distinct and separate indeed from one another; the one of interest at least in the first instance to the antiquarian, the other of importance to all parishioners without exception: the one is, that the discovery through excavations in fields distant from a village, of relics showing traces of former Christian burials, does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that a Christian church once stood there; and the other is, that objections, strong, numerous, and irrefutable, existed of old, even as they do still exist, each year in increasing force, against burials within the walls of parish churches. I venture to assert that,—whatever may be pleaded to the contrary on the score of doing special honour to those whose light may have shone before men, as the light of Christ's disciples shine, and who are resting in the faith and hope of a joyful resurrection,—yet the practice—for of custom I deny that it has obtained the name—the practice of breaking up the paving of a parish church, in order to provide for the interment of a body beneath that pavement, is open to prohibition."

Mr. Renouf's masterly pamphlet on *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius* (Longmans), comes in very opportunely to clench the protracted controversy between Father Ryder and Dr. Ward, of which the public was getting heartily tired. We have said all along, as our readers are aware, that while our sympathies are with Father Ryder, it is impossible not to see that he has surrendered the key of the whole position in admitting the principle of Papal infallibility. When that is once conceded it is a mere question of time and strategy how long the outposts may be defended, the Ultramontanes are sure of gaining the fortress in the end. But then, on the other hand, every argument Dr. Ward employs to demolish the elaborate distinctions constructed by his opponent, in order to prove that the infallible Pope is hardly ever able to commit himself to an infallible pronouncement, tells with tenfold force against that very tenet of Papal infallibility, which is the very foundation of the whole Ultramontane system. While the disputants are wrangling over the precise nature and conditions of the supposed prerogative, Mr. Renouf quietly lops off the branch they are both sitting on, and drops them hard, with the significant warning that "time will show whether or no it be wise to identify Christianity with a system of theology which is demons-

trably untenable." We have repeated the same warning over and over again, but it will come with accumulated force from one of the earliest and most learned of the converts to the Roman Church, against whose loyalty to his adopted faith no whisper of suspicion has been breathed. The lapse of Pope Honorius into heresy is an old story, but we doubt if it has ever been exhibited so clearly and fully or with such crushing force as here. The decree of the Sixth Œcumenical Council, subscribed by the Papal legates and confirmed with repeated anathemas, is explicit enough :—

"Having read the dogmatic letters written by Sergius, late Patriarch of this God-protected and Imperial city, both to Cyrus Bishop of Phasis, *and Honorius late Bishop of the elder Rome*, and likewise the reply written by him, that is, Honorius, to Sergius, and having found them to be *altogether alien from the Apostolic teachings and those defined by the holy Synods, and all the eminent holy Fathers, but following the false teachings of the heretics, we reject them entirely, and loathe them as soul-destroying.* And we have judged that the names of those whose impious doctrines we execrate should be cast out of the Church; that is, Sergius, formerly prelate of this God-protected and Imperial city, who began to write about this impious dogma; Cyrus of Alexandria; Pyrrhus; Paul and Peter, who have also been prelates in the see of this God-protected and Imperial city; and those who agree with them . . . And besides these, we have determined that Honorius, the late Pope of elder Rome, should be cast out of the holy Church of God, and be anathematised with them, because we have found, from the letter written by him to Sergius, that he followed the mind of the latter in all things, and gave authority to his impious dogmas."

Not only was Honorius solemnly anathematised as a heretic by the Third Council of Constantinople; not only was the sentence pronounced upon him solemnly ratified by Leo II., by the two next Œcumenical Councils, and by the Popes who confirmed them; not only did Leo himself denounce him as one who "through his profane betrayal suffered the Apostolic Church to be polluted, and had incurred everlasting damnation;" but the record of that fact was actually contained in a lection of the Roman Breviary, read annually by every Roman cleric till the seventeenth century. Then, in deference to the new-fledged dogma of Papal infallibility, the name of Honorius was expunged, as the name of the heretical Pope Liberius had been expunged shortly before from another lection in the Breviary. That fact alone speaks volumes. When people begin to cook history, their case is desperate. It might be thought indeed that the avowed Monotholism of Honorius, officially set forth in three letters to the Eastern Patriarchs, and his reiterated condemnation *for*

heresy by three Œcumenical Councils and many Popes, would have stopped the mouths of Ultramontane divines for ever. They can only maintain his infallibility at the expense of that of his successors and the whole Church ever since. But they knew that their whole position was at stake, and they have made a desperate fight against the cruel logic of demonstrated facts; though they "constantly hesitate between solutions which are asserted to be indisputable, but which are nevertheless subversive of each other." First, they asserted that the whole thing was a fable, and all the documents which proved it forgeries. Pighius supported this startling paradox by the suicidal argument that "there is nothing worthy of the dignity and authority of the Roman Church in the letters of the Pope, or the words and acts of his legates in the Council." True enough, on his own principles, but so much the worse for the Ultramontane theory of what is due to the dignity and authority of Rome. Even Ultramontane impudence however, has been shamed out of this childish Pyrrhonism now. The next solution devised was that Honorius was unjustly condemned, and Papal court divines like Baronius and Bellarmine have had the decency and consistency to brand the sentence of an Œcumenical Council, ratified by the reigning Pope, as "inconceivably erroneous, wicked, impudent, and stupid." That line of defence may be left to refute itself. The next subterfuge hit upon, and which is still the favourite Ultramontane pretext, is that Honorius was not condemned for heresy but for carelessness, which is much as if one were to say that the Fenian convicts were not hung for murder but for failing to warn the police. No words need be wasted on an argument which those who use it cannot possibly believe. Nor will the more ingenious sophism of making Honorius fall into heresy as a private doctor, and not as Pope, bear a moment's examination. He was publicly asked for his decision by the other Patriarchs, and he publicly gave it. Not that they for a moment recognised his infallibility, though they very naturally wished to gain the support of the Bishop of the chief See. On the contrary, Sophronius of Jerusalem expressly lays down the orthodox doctrine which he wishes the Pope to confirm, and says he will in no case swerve from it himself. So much dishonest special pleading has been employed in this convenient distinction between the Pope in his official and his private capacity, that we will quote M. Renouf's trenchant remarks on the subject:—

"A miserable evasion of the difficulty is sought in the fact that the letters of Honorius do not contain anathemas. And it is also considered of great importance that Honorius did not command his letters to be published. It is incredible that one should interpret the words spoken to St. Peter as proving the infallibility of every one of his successors, and yet limit the

exercise of this infallibility by purely arbitrary conditions. But this limitation has merely been devised by modern controversialists in order to get over difficulties otherwise insuperable. Some of the most remarkable dogmatic letters of Roman pontiffs fulfil these absurd conditions as little as the letters of Pope Honorius. St. Leo's letter to St. Flavian contains no orders about its publication. On the other hand Honorius, who wrote to Eastern patriarchs 'for the instruction of those in perplexity,' most certainly desired and implied that his decision should be made public. His letters contain no anathemas, neither do certain well-known dogmatic letters of Gregory II. on the subject of the Iconoclastic controversy. Anathemas are only issued against contumacious heretics. Honorius had no reason for supposing that he had to do with such. Sergius agreed with him, and the messengers of Sophronius consented to suppress the formula of 'two operations.' But it is easy to show that the popes did not imagine that their most solemn judgments were subjected to the conditions which modern controversialists have invented."

The fact is, that the opinion which "an influential party in the Church" is doing its best to get made into a dogma is but the mushroom growth of yesterday. It was never heard of before the sixteenth century, and can only be defined, as our author observes, by exploding for ever the rule of S. Vincent and the Tridentine decree, which binds the Church to interpret Scripture according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. It is equally in the teeth of Fathers, of schoolmen, and of facts, and it was only by the aid of the spurious decretals that the baseless principles on which Jesuit ingenuity afterwards constructed it, could ever have obtained entrance into the Church. We have no room to follow Mr. Renouf through his luminous demonstration of all this, but we earnestly recommend his pamphlet—which is clear, concise, and cheap—to all our readers, Anglican or Roman. The case of Liberius is no less fatal than that of Honorius to the Ultramontane view, while another Pope, Gregory II., actually pronounced that a man might in certain cases marry a second wife while the first was still living!

Mr. Renouf concludes with a sketch of the present state of parties in the Roman Catholic Church, which is very interesting, but which we have no room to extract or even to analyse. Suffice it to say that he considers the spread of Ultramontane opinions of late almost entirely due to *convert* influences both in England and France, and to the decay of theological learning in the latter country, which was consequent on the first Revolution and "the fall of the venerable Sorbonne." Even now he says that all the learned priests he ever met, or indeed heard of, during a residence of many years in France, were

determined Gallicans. In England, he remembers a time when Ultramontanism hardly existed among secular priests, and Cardinal Wiseman publicly denounced "the exaggerated principles" of the *Tablet* under convert editorship. "The Oxford movement brought many into the Church who were persuaded, even while they were Protestants, that Ultramontanism is the only consistent Catholicism," and of these many have since become priests. "But it is far less through their teaching than through the zealous activity of lay journalists (the *Dublin* and *Register* to wit), that the minds of English Catholics have been leavened with Ultramontane ideas." The author concludes with a broad hint that, if these ideas are formulated into dogmas, a schism will be the inevitable result. It has long been our own conviction that Re-union is the only security against it.

Mr. Chatterton Dix's *Altar Songs* (London: Palmer) are in a second edition which is in every respect, as regards typography, an improvement on the first. The book is singularly beautiful and remarkably cheap.

Art. XXI.—RATIONALE OF THE SERVICES OF THE HOLY EASTERN CHURCH.—Part II.

To ascertain the origin of the three Public Services which form the groundwork of the worship of the Orthodox Church, it is necessary to bear in mind the circumstances of the Church at the earliest stages of its existence, and the relations existing between it, and the system it was destined to supersede. For about the first sixty years of its existence, the Christian Church can scarcely be said to have had any strictly public form of worship of its own, according to what we now understand by the term. The Apostles themselves, as is well known, did not entirely withdraw themselves from the Jewish assemblies; nor did they forsake the Temple worship, until the Temple itself was destroyed, and the sacrifices of the old law thus utterly abolished, as it were by the express fiat of the Almighty. Then it was that, the Jewish Church being visibly superseded in the eyes of all men, the Christian Church, with its law of liberty, and its sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, was ready to take its place. The working of Divine Providence is here clearly manifest: for a time, we know, the Lord's Supper was not celebrated in such a manner as to constitute what could properly be called an act of public worship. As the *showing forth the Lord's death until He come*, it must undoubtedly have been regarded by the Church, from the very first, as destined to become in due time, that which in fact it has since become, the chief and most significant act of Divine Worship: still, while the Temple, with its symbolical services continued, that time had not arrived; it was fitting that the eye of faith should not be distracted by the spectacle of the co-existence of two diverse forms of Public Worship, both of them manifestly of Divine Institution: but when the Temple was destroyed, never to be rebuilt, the entire abolition of the old dispensation was visible and complete, and its ceremonial was superseded by that of the Church of Christ. And in this consideration we very probably see one literal reason for the restriction of the ceremonial law of the Jews with regard to place. Had it been lawful to celebrate its rites in any locality which the convenience of the worshippers might indicate, the system might have been perpetuated down to this very day, in spite of the downfall of the nation, and in that case its express and positive Institution, unless it had been abrogated by an equally express and positive repeal, would have doubtless insured the adherence of many Chris-

tians, and given rise to a greater variety of schism than even we have to deplore; for it is observable, that the decision of the Council of Jerusalem, recorded in the Acts, is after all permissive, it only removed the obligation of keeping the law from the Gentile converts, and a detailed and obligatory decree for the abolition of the ancient ceremonial would have been a measure very inconsistent with the principles by which the Apostles were guided in their regulation of the infant Church.

The celebration of the Lord's Supper was, for a considerable time, the only distinctive service of the Christian Church, and when the abolition of the Temple service was complete, this solemn act was ready to take its place; and was then performed as a public service, and thus came to be called *the* Liturgy, this term signifying its pre-eminence over all other acts of worship. It was at first, no doubt, generally celebrated in the evening, and hence a necessity arose for a service to be provided for the other part of the day: thus the Morning Service, comes to be the most ancient service of the Christian Church, next to the Liturgy. The Morning Service, indeed, was the first which owed its origin to the devotion of the Church, for the Liturgy was instituted by our Divine Lord Himself, and we have strong corroborative evidence of the truth of this fact, from the very constitution of the service. What were the sources from whence the Church would naturally derive her materials for it? Necessarily, from the poetical portions of Holy Scripture, for the most part. Like all the other services of the Primitive Church, it consists of Psalms and Hymns, alternating with supplicatory and intercessory prayers, bidden by the Deacon, *in the name* of the people, and responded to by them; and accompanied by sacramental or ritual orisons, said by the Bishop or Priest *for* them. Now it is remarkable that the Church threw all such compositions then available into the Morning Service, without appearing to have contemplated the necessity of reserving any of them for any other part of the day, so that this service absorbed, as it were, the whole of the religious poetry appropriated by the Church from Holy Scripture. None of it appears to have been husbanded, so to speak, for use in another service; for all the nine Scripture odes, which constitute all the rhythmical portions of Holy Scripture, used as hymns by the Eastern Church, are appropriated to it, as well as the sublime greater doxology, and the three last laudatory Psalms.

In course of time, as is well known, the Liturgy was always celebrated in the morning, a change which would naturally ensue upon its taking the place of the Temple worship; and

thus it came to pass that the evening came to be the part of the day unprovided with an appropriate service, and the Evening Service was compiled to supply the deficiency. The arrangement of the service is such as clearly to bear out this view of its origin; it is evidently formed upon the model of the Morning Service, but the Church has been forced to have recourse to the material left behind, after the selection had been made of the poetical passages which are appropriated to the morning. Hence, instead of the six beautiful Psalms, we have the 103rd Psalm; instead of the Scripture odes, the 140th, 141st, 129th, and 116th Psalms are recited, and, in the place of the greater doxology, the hymn, "Joyful Light," which is the germ of the whole service, most probably having been used at the introduction of light, during the celebration of the Liturgy. And we have a most interesting illustration of the retention of this arrangement, in the order of the Liturgy of the Forehallowed, in which part of the Liturgy is combined with the Evening Service, in order that, during Lent, the reception of Communion may not interfere with the fast. In this service, after the hymn, "Joyful Light," the priest, holding the censer in his right hand, together with a lighted taper, makes the sign of the cross with it towards the holy table, saying: "Sophia orthoi," and then, turning towards the people, and shewing the light, says, "The Light of Christ shineth to all," after which the lessons are read. This rite is, no doubt, the ancient form of the introduction of light, for which the hymn is an appropriate thanksgiving.

In order to describe the arrangement of the Morning and Evening Services with greater ease and intelligibility, I shall divide them into four stages, independently of the introduction and conclusion. It will be seen, in accordance with what I have already intimated, that every stage of the Morning Service is considerably longer than the corresponding one for the Evening. These stages, on the whole, are formed as follows: The *first* contains the fixed Psalm, or Psalms, of the service, during which the priest recites several appropriate orisons; it concludes with the Irenica. The *second* consists of the *versation* or moveable Psalms of the day, and ends with the Short Ektene. The *third* contains the canon in the morning, and the Psalms substituted for it in the evening. The basis of the *fourth* is, in the morning, the Great Doxology, or "Morning Hymn;" in the evening, the "Joyful Light," or "Evening Hymn."

The introduction is, for the most part, the same in all services. If a priest be present, he commences with the

Blessing: "Blessed be our God, always, now and ever, and to the ages of ages." If no priest be present, it commences thus: "At the prayers of our holy fathers, Lord Jesus Christ, our God, have mercy upon us, Amen." It then proceeds:

"O heavenly King, the Comforter, the Spirit of truth, Who art everywhere present, and fillest all things, the Treasure of good things, and Giver of life, come, and abide in us, and cleanse us from all stain, and save our souls, O Good.

"Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us. (*Thrice.*)

"Glory to Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost: both now and ever, and to the ages of ages. Amen.

"Most holy Trinity, have mercy upon us. Lord, cleanse us from our sins. Master, forgive our wickednesses. Holy One, look upon us, and heal our weaknesses for Thy Name's sake. Kyrie eleison. Kyrie eleison. Kyrie eleison. Glory, &c., both now, &c. Our Father, &c."

The Priest chaunts the conclusion thus:—

"For Thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, now and ever, and to the ages of ages. Amen.

"Kyrie eleison: *twelve times.*

"O come, let us worship and fall down unto God our King.

"O come, let us worship and fall down unto God, Christ our King.

"O come, let us worship and fall down unto Christ Himself, our King and God."

The hymn, "O heavenly King," is from the office for Pentecost, which is the work of S. John Damascene; the antiquity of this, therefore, and probably of the rest of the Introductory Service, is not equal to that of the greater part of what follows. The sentences, "O come let us worship," may be considered as the Eastern form of the Invitatory, although they are said at every service.

The introduction, as we have said, is usually said as above, at the beginning of every service, but for the Morning Service it is somewhat altered; after the Blessing by the Priest, the invitatory sentences are said, then the 19th and 20th * Psalms, then "Glory; both now," the Trisagion, The Lord's Prayer, the Troparia for the kings and "the city;" the Priest then says part of the repeated Ektene, with the exclamation;

* The numbering of the Septuagint is, of course, followed.

the people then say, "In the Name of the Lord, bless, Father."

The Priest. "Glory to the Holy, and Consubstantial, and Quickening, and Undivided Trinity, always, now and ever," &c. The occasions of these variations are very obvious; the two Psalms and the Troparia, with the Ektene, were evidently added when the Eastern Empire began to be threatened by the Saracens; the doxology originated with the triumph of the Church over Arianism.

We now arrive at the first stage of the Morning Service, of which the six Psalms form the basis. The rubric runs: "Then we begin the Hexapsalmus, listening with all silence and penitence, and the appointed brother, or the Hegumen, saith, with reverence and fear of God: *

Glory to God in the Highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men. (*Thrice.*)

O Lord, Thou wilt open my lips, and my mouth shall shew forth Thy praise. (*Twice.*)

PSALM III.

And again (after the last verse): "I have laid down and slept, I have arisen, for the Lord kept me.

PSALM XXXVII.

And again: "Forsake me not, O Lord my God, depart not from me.

"Come unto my help, O Lord of my salvation."

PSALM LXII.

And again: "In the mornings will I meditate upon Thee, for Thou art become my help, and in the shadow of Thy wings will I rejoice.

"My soul cleaveth after Thee, and Thy right hand hath kept me.

"Glory, both now. Alleluia *thrice*, Glory to Thee, O God. Alleluia *thrice*, Glory to Thee O God. Alleluia *thrice*, Glory to Thee O God. Glory, both now." *Without penances. And the Priest cometh forth from the Bema, and saith the Morning Prayers before the Ikon of the Lord Christ, secretly.*

PSALM LXXXVII.

And again: "O Lord, the God of my salvation, by day have I cried, and in the night before Thee.

* The Euchologion adds: "as speaking invisibly to Him, and grieving over our sins."

"Let my prayer come into Thy sight, bow down Thine ear unto my prayer."

PSALM CII.

And again: "In every place of His dominion, bless the Lord, O my soul."

PSALM CXLII.

"Hear me, O Lord, in Thy justice, and enter not into judgment with Thy servant (*Twice*),

Then:

"Thy good Spirit shall lead me into a right land. Glory, both now. Alleluia, &c. *Three penances. And the Priest saith the Irenica. Afterwards, in the tone of the Troparion of the day:*

"God is the Lord, Who hath shewed us light: blessed be he that cometh in the Name of the Lord.

Ps. 1. "Praise the Lord, and call upon His holy Name. God is the Lord, &c.

Ps. 2. "All the Gentiles surrounded me, and in the Name of the Lord I destroyed them. God is the Lord, &c.

Ps. 3. "By the Lord is this done, and it is marvellous in our eyes. God is the Lord, &c. *Then we say the Troparion of the occurring Feast, or of the Saint, or of the Resurrection of the proper Tone.*"

In Lent, instead of the "God is Lord," Alleluia is sung thrice, after four verses, different from those given above, and then three *Triadic Hymns* are sung.

The six Psalms, it will be seen, are ordered to be read, and their use in this manner dates from the ages of persecution of the Church; it was in these words that the confessors and martyrs expressed their faith and trust in God, in their antelucan assemblies; after the subdued tone which prevails throughout them, the words, God is Lord! announces the coming triumph of the Church. Tropologically, at least, they are equally applicable in our day, and when the time arrives of the great tribulation, the Church will again recur to the same application of them, which she made in her early days. The "penance," certain of which are ordered to accompany the doxology at the end of the Psalms, signifies a deep inclination, low enough for the fingers to touch the ground; the sign of the Cross is made at the same time. The Morning Prayers, which are said by the Priest during the recitation of the three last Psalms, are twelve in number, answering to the hours of

the day; here we have the Priest fulfilling one of his sacred functions, that, namely, of praying for the people.

The second stage consists of the recitation of the portion of the Psalter appointed for the day. The 150 Psalms are divided into twenty Kathisms; and of these either two or three are said at Morning Service, according to the season; the whole Psalter is repeated at least once every week. Each Kathism is divided into three staseis, and at the end of each stasis (not of each Psalm), the lesser doxology is repeated, with three Alleluias, and the words, "Glory to Thee, O God," three times repeated; then Kyrie eleison, thrice; and then the "Glory, both now," again. At the end of the first Kathism, two troparia, called Kathismata, are said, with "Glory, both now," and a Theotokion, then the Short Ektene. At the end of the second Kathism, two more Kathismata, another Theotokion, and the Short Ektene. After the last Kathism, whether two or three be said, the fiftieth Psalm is sung.

On Sundays there is a sort of appendix to the second stage of Morning Service, consisting of the Hypakoe, the Anavathmoi, the Prokeimenon of the Resurrection, an exclamation by the priest, after which the Deacon says: "Let every breath praise the Lord." The choir sing: "Praise God in His Holiness, Praise Him in the firmament of His power." *Deacon:* "That He would make us worthy to hear His Holy Gospel, let us intreat the Lord our God." *Choir:* Kyrie eleison (*thrice*). *Deacon:* "Sophia; Orthoi; let us hear the Holy Gospel." The Morning Gospel is then read by the Priest; who then carries the Book into the midst of the Church, and the faithful approach one by one and kiss it, whilst a Troparion on the Resurrection is being sung: then follows the fiftieth Psalm, with two or three penitential troparia. Then the Deacon says: "O God, save Thy people," as in the Lité.

The third stage consists of the Kanons; after the third Ode, and again after the sixth, the Short Ektene is said; and after the sixth stand the Kontakion and Oikos, and the Synaxarion. All these terms have been already explained. After the ninth, or last Ode, the Short Ektene is again repeated.

The forth stage forms what is called "The Praises," which bear the same relation to the Morning Service of the Eastern Church as Lauds does to the Western Matins. It commences with the Exaposteilarion, and then the three last Psalms, 148th, 149th, and 150th; but on Sunday simply, "Let every breath praise the Lord. Praise the Lord from the heavens, praise Him in the Highest. To Thee is due a

hymn, O God," with these two verses: ℣ 1, "Arise, O Lord my God, let Thine Hand be exalted, forget not the poor unto the end." ℣ 2, "I will acknowledge Thee, O Lord, with my whole heart, I will narrate all Thy wonders."

Then, "Glory," *the Eothinon*, "both now," *a Theotokion*, and then the Great Doxology, followed by these verses:

"Every day will I bless Thee, and praise Thy Name to the ages, and to the ages of ages.

"Lord, Thou hast been a refuge to us in generation and generation. I have said: Lord have mercy upon me, heal my soul, for I have sinned against Thee.

"Lord, unto Thee have I fled, teach me to do Thy Will, for Thou art my God.

"For with Thee is the source of life, in Thy light shall we see light.

"Extend Thy mercy to them that know Thee.

"Vouchsafe, O Lord, this day to keep us without sin.

"Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the God of our Fathers, and praised and glorified be Thy Name unto the ages. Amen.

"Lord, let Thy mercy be upon us, for we have trusted in Thee.

"Blessed art Thou, O Lord, teach me Thy justifications (*thrice*).

"Lord, Thy Mercy is unto the ages: despise not the works of Thy Hands.

"To Thee is due praise, to Thee is due a hymn, to Thee the glory is due, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, now and ever, and to the ages of ages. Amen."

It will immediately be seen how these verses, following upon the "Gloria in excelsis," form, with it, a whole strikingly suggestive of the Ambrosian Hymn, "Te Deum," and the antiquity of this arrangement is testified by the fact that the "Gloria in excelsis" with these verses, as far as "Extend Thy mercy," are contained in Codex A. at the end of the Psalter.

After this comes the repeated Ektene, with its exclamation, then the Long Ektene, the Exclamation, and the prayer of Inclination already translated (p. 247).

This completes the body of the Morning Service; the conclusion I shall give at the end of the Evening Service, which I shall now proceed to compare with the Morning.

In the first stage, instead of six Psalms, we have only one, the 103rd, called the Proemiac; instead of twelve, we have only seven prayers to be said by the Priest; after the "Glory, both now," and Alleluias, the Irenica follow, as at the end of the first stage in the morning.

In the second stage, instead of two or three Kathisms from the Psalter, only one is read, the Short Ektene being repeated after each Stasis, as before.

In the third stage, instead of nine Scripture Odes, we have the 140th, 141st, 129th, and 116th Psalms, recited as one Ode, and arranged for the interpolation of Stichoi, as the Odes are for Troparia. In order that this arrangement may be understood, I transcribe it from the Horologion; the insertion begins before the last verse of the 141st Psalm:

For Stich 10.

"Bring my soul out of prison, that I may acknowledge to Thy Name.

"The righteous wait for me, until Thou reward me.

For Stich 8.

(PSALM CXXIX.)

"Out of the depths have I cried unto Thee, O Lord: Lord, hear my voice.

"Let Thine ears be attentive to the voice of my prayer.

For Stich 6.

"If Thou wilt mark iniquities, O Lord: Lord, who shall stand? for with Thee is forgiveness.

"For Thy Name's sake have I waited for Thee, O Lord: my soul hath waited for Thy Word, my soul hath hoped in the Lord.

For Stich 4.

"From the morning watch until night, from the morning watch let Israel hope in the Lord.

"For with the Lord there is mercy, and with Him plenteous redemption: and He will redeem Israel from all his iniquities.

(PSALM CXVI.)

"O praise the Lord all ye heathen, praise Him all ye people.

"For His mercy is confirmed upon us, and the truth of the Lord remaineth for ever.

"Glory, both now."

As the number of Stichoi vary, they are introduced as here directed; when there are ten, the first two are inserted before "Bring my soul." When there are eight, before "Out of the depths," and so on.

The fourth stage commences with the Evening Hymn; the ceremonies attending this part of the Service are of pecu-

liar beauty. As soon as the verses are nearly ended, the Priest says the "Prayer of Entrance," as follows :—

"At morning and evening, and noonday, we praise, we bless, we give thanks to Thee; we pray Thee, Lord of all, direct our prayer as incense before Thee, and let not our hearts be turned away to words or thoughts of wickedness, but preserve us from all them that hunt after our souls; for Lord, O Lord, our eyes are turned unto Thee; in Thee have we hoped; make us not ashamed, O our God. For to Thee is due all glory, honour, and worship, and to Thee we ascribe the glory; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, now, and ever, and to the ages of ages. Amen.

"*Then the holy doors are thrown open and the Deacon holding the censer goeth before the Priest through the north door of the Bema, and so round in front of the holy doors. When the verses are finished we sing the Thanksgiving for light, an ancient poem, as some say, of Athenagoras the Martyr.*" The Prokimenon of the day follows. Then the repeated Ektene, with the exclamation. After that, the reader repeats part of the Ode which follows the Great Doxology, beginning, "Vouchsafe, O Lord, this evening," and the body of the Service terminates, like that of the Morning Service, with the Long Ektene, and a prayer of Inclination.

In the Evening Service, the conclusion is preceded by the Stichera of the Stichos, which are proper for the day, if it be a festival; if not, the 122nd Psalm is said instead, in two stichera; the Ode of Symeon, "Nunc Dimittis," follows; then, "*Trisagion*," "Glory to Father," "Most holy Trinity," "Our Father," "For Thine is." *The Apolytikion of the occurring Feast or of the day.* "Glory," "both now." Then follows the conclusion proper.

This conclusion varies greatly in different editions of the Office Books; perhaps few Churches are exactly alike in their way of performing it. I give what apparently is the most correct form.

"*Deacon:* Wisdom! Bless!

"*Priest:* Blessed be Jehovah, Christ our God always, now, and ever, and to the ages of ages. Amen.

"*And we confirm the Kings saying*: Heavenly King, confirm our faithful Kings: stablish the Faith: reprove the heathen: pacify the world: guard well this holy abode (or this city): set our departed fathers and brethren in the abodes of the just: and receive us in penitence and thanksgiving, as Good and the Lover of men."

Or more briefly:

"Confirm, O God, Orthodox Kings, and the holy Orthodox Faith of all Orthodox Christians, to the ages of ages. Amen.

Three great penances, and the dismission: "Glory to Thee, Christ our God, our help. Glory to Thee.

"May Christ our true God (*on the Lord's Day:* Who rose from the dead), at the prayers of our most pure Lady, the Mother of God and ever Virgin Mary; the holy, glorious, and all famous Apostles, and all the Saints; have mercy upon us, and save us, as Good, and the Lover of men.

"At the prayers of our holy Fathers, O Lord Jesus Christ our God, have mercy upon us. Amen."

Having thus given the form of Morning and Evening Service on ordinary days, it remains for me to show the variations that are made in them on different occasions. Sometimes the Evening Service is shortened, by omitting the Kathism from the Psalms, and the Long Etkene; and diminishing the number of stichoi at the "Lord, I have called upon Thee:" it is then called Little Vespers, or Evening Service. On the other hand, it is sometimes lengthened, by the Lité being said after the Prayer of Inclination, and on some occasions the Benediction of the loaves is also added: this is performed as follows:—

"*The Kellarite bringeth out five loaves, such as we eat at meals, and layeth them in a paten with some wheat on a side table, with a vessel of the best wine, and another of oil. The Priest taketh one loaf in his hand, and saith this prayer, with a loud voice:* Lord Jesus Christ our God, Who didst bless the five loaves in the wilderness, and didst feed five thousand men; bless these loaves, and this corn, wine, and oil; and multiply them all in this house and in Thy world; and hallow the faithful that partake of them. For it is Thou Who blessest and hallowest all things, Christ our God, and to Thee we ascribe the glory, with Thine eternal Father, and Thine all holy, and good, and quickening Spirit, now, &c. Amen.

And we say, "I will bless the Lord at all times:" *down to* "shall not be deprived of any good." (Psalm xxxiii.)

"*And the Priest goeth out and standeth before the holy doors looking towards the West. And after the Psalm is ended, he saith:*

"The blessing of the Lord come upon us, by His grace

and love to men; always, now, and ever, and to the ages of ages. *Choir:* Amen.

"*The Priest maketh the dismissal.*"

On occasions when there is a Vigil, shorter Evening Service is said with Compline; then, an hour or two after, the Vigil begins with Great Vespers or Evening Service, as far as the Prayer of Inclination; after the Prokeimenon, come the lessons from Scripture, of which in fact the Prokeimenon is only the proper introduction; after the Prayer of Inclination, the special Idiomela of the day are sung. Dr. Neale thus writes of this part of the Service: "It seems that the Church has employed all the Idiomela that her sons have poured into her treasury, to be sung in the quiet hours of the night, and in the narthex, glowing with processional torches:" for the Priest, Deacon, and Choir, form a procession, and go into the narthex, dividing themselves into two choirs. After this comes the Benediction of the loaves, then the Mesonyctikon or Midnight Service, the Morning Service, and the first hour, all forming one long service, often lasting for six or eight hours.

But it is to be observed that it is very much left to the discretion of the Priest, whether a long or short Service be said, how many Stichera or Troparia be recited, and which of the additional rites are to be used. Variations also occur as to the minor accessories, but the outline which has here been given will afford a general notion of the arrangement and effect of the whole, and, in order to compare the two Services with greater ease, the following scheme will be found of use.

CONSPECTUS OF THE MORNING AND EVENING SERVICES.

ORDER OF THE MORNING SERVICE.

INTRODUCTION—*The Blessing.* "O come let us worship." *Pss.* 19, 20. "Glory," "both now," *Trisagion*, "Our Father," "For thine is." *The Troparia. Priest*—"Have mercy upon us." *Exclamation*, "In the name." *Priest*—Glory, &c.

FIRST STAGE—*The Six Psalms* (3, 37, 62, 87, 102, 142). *The Irenica.* "The Lord is God," *with its verses. The Apolytikion and the Theotokion.*

SECOND STAGE—*The First Kathism; the Kathismata. The Short Ektene. The Second Kathism, Kathismata. On Sundays the Blameless, the Evlogetaria, and the Short Ektene.*

(*On Sundays: The Hypakoe, Anavathmoi, Prokimenon, of the Resurrection.* "Let every breath." *Morning Gospel.* "Beholding the Resurrection." *Psalm L. The Deacon*—"O God save Thy people," *as in the Lité, Exclamation.*)

THIRD STAGE—*The Kanons. After the 3rd Ode, the Short Ektene. After the 6th Ode, the Kontakion and Oikos; the Synaxarion, the Short Ektene. After the 9th Ode, the Short Ektene.*

FOURTH STAGE—*Exaposteilarion of the Resurrection or of the Saint. The Praises*, "Glory," *Eothinon*, "both now." "Most blessed art Thou." *The Great Doxology, and Troparion of the Resurrection. The Repeated Ektene. The Long Ektene. Prayer of Inclination.*

CONCLUSION—

"Wisdom." "Bless." "Blessed be Jehovah." "Confirm, O God, Orthodox Kings," *and the Dismission.*

ORDER OF THE EVENING SERVICE.

INTRODUCTION—*The Blessing*, "Heavenly King," *Trisagion*, "Most Holy Trinity," "Our Father," "For thine is." Kyrie eleison, xii. "Glory," "both now," "O come let us worship," iii.

FIRST STAGE—*The Proemiac Psalm* (103). *The Irenica.*

SECOND STAGE—*The Proper Kathism. The Short Ektene.*

THIRD STAGE—The "Lord, I have cried." (Pss. 140, 141, 129, 116.) *with its verses.*

FOURTH STAGE—"Joyful Light." *Prokimenon. The Repeated Ektene.* "Vouchsafe, O Lord, this evening." *The Long Ektene. The Prayer of Inclination.*

CONCLUSION—*The Ode of Symeon. Trisagion.* "Glory," "both now." "Most holy Trinity." "Our Father." "For thine is." *The Apolytikion.* "Glory," "both now."
"Wisdom." "Bless." "Blessed be Jehovah." "Confirm, O God, Orthodox Kings," *and the Dismission.*

Art. XXII.—CARDINAL YORK.

The claims of hereditary descent, which in our day are so lightly set aside, retained fast hold of men's minds during the last century. With all the disadvantages under which the House of Stuart laboured, their constant profession of the Roman Catholic religion, and the unfounded yet widely prevalent doubts of the Chevalier de St. George being really the son of James II., the exiled family had a multitude of adherents in England, Scotland, and Ireland. If Prince James had been a man of greater capacity, and his Scottish chiefs had been more united in 1715, he might clearly have recovered the throne of his fathers, since even in 1745, when the Jacobite feeling throughout the country had in great measure died away, Charles Edward, his son, established himself as Regent in Holyrood palace, and marched triumphantly as far as Derby.* George III. being a born Briton, and beloved by the people, his long reign was undisturbed by any Stuart rising; yet his title to the crown was constantly disputed, from 1760 to 1766 by Prince James; from 1766 to 1788 by Prince Charles Edward; and from 1788 to 1807 by Henry Benedict, Duke and Cardinal of York. Even Queen Charlotte had a rival in the person of Prince Charles's widow, the Countess of Albany. It must have been strange indeed to see this lady received at St. James's by George III. and his Queen, taken by them to the Opera, and to the closing of Parliament, and sitting as Princess of Stolberg (her maiden name), at the foot of her own throne! Even then, as we learn from Horace Walpole, she sealed with the royal arms; the servants of her household addressed her as "your Majesty;" all her plate, down to the teaspoons, bore the arms of Great Britain; and in the Hôtel de Bourgoyne, her Paris residence, there was a chair of state with a canopy, in one of the apartments, surmounted also by the regal insignia.† To the last she maintained the form and ceremony of Queen Dowager of England, and she appeared in company without any mourning for the Princess Charlotte as late as the 22nd of December, 1817,‡ being the only lady present so attired.

Madame D'Albany was supported in her mock royalty by Cardinal York to the day of his death, which happened in

* Earl Stanhope's *History of England*, vol. iii. 215, 268.
† Sir William Wraxall's *Memoirs*.
‡ *Diary of an Invalid*, by Mathews.

1807. When his brother, Prince Charles, died in 1788, he issued a proclamation in which he styled himself "Henry IX., King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith;" and this document was approved by Pope Pius VI. as "sensible and judicious," in a letter to Cardinal Negroni. It was in fact an innocent assertion of the principle of hereditary right, and of so little practical importance that the English Government could afford to pass it over with a smile. Indeed the King of England *de facto* was so far from resenting the conduct of the King of England *de jure*, that he subsequently allowed his rival a pension of 4,000*l.* a year. This was certainly generous on the part of George III., considering how much the Stuarts had cost the nation in the rebellions of 1715 and 1745, and considering also that the last claimant to the throne was a Bishop of the Church of Rome, and, as Cardinal, closely attached to its Court. The Papal authorities then clung far more tenaciously to hereditary descent than they do now, for the Roman Curia is, however unwillingly, influenced by the opinions of the time, and compelled in many instances to recognise as valid regal claims which are but of yesterday, and derive their force only from conspiracy, revolution, and the people's will. It was owing to Papal recognition that the exiled Stuarts successively, father, son, and two grandsons,* retained a certain *prestige* on the continent, and kept up the semblance of a Court. It was felt at the Vatican that if their cause and title were wholly abandoned, the doctrine of the people being the true source of kingly power must be accepted, and to this the Court of Rome has always been decidedly averse. It will never allow it in theory, even when obliged to submit to it practically; and the names of "James III." and "Charles III.," Kings of England, are therefore to be seen at this moment conspicuously carved on durable monuments in St. Peter's at Rome.

The life of Cardinal York was very peaceful, and marked by few striking events; yet some particulars respecting him, which may be gleaned from various histories and books of travels, can hardly fail to be interesting. If personally he was of small mark, the line of kings he represented and closed was remarkable alike for its martial exploits and long series of unexampled misfortune. Adversity seemed a part of their destiny,† yet it was so only because indiscretion marred their policy and blighted their schemes. "What crime," asked

* James II., James III., Charles III., Henry IX.
† Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XV.*

Macnamara bitterly of Prince Charles Edward, when he persisted in retaining a mistress and refused to marry, "what crime has your family committed that it thus draws down, age after age, the wrath of Heaven on all its members?" Even Charles II., who "never said a foolish thing," though he "never did a wise one," predicted to the Prince of Orange that, when his brother James came to the throne, "he would go on so madly that in four years it would be up with him."* The time prophesied was short, yet in four years precisely, from 1685 to 1689, James II. managed to fulfil the prediction, ruin the cause of his Church in England, forfeit his crown, and procure for himself and his descendants exile, poverty, and hopeless disgrace. We say hopeless, because such it proved as time went on, though in the early part of the 18th century the hopes of the Stuarts ran high, and there appeared to be a great probability of their returning to the seat of power without bloodshed. Queen Anne was known to be favourable to the claims of her half-brother Prince James,† and many eminent statesmen, Marlborough, Carmarthen, Russell, Bolingbroke, Oxford, Ormond, and Atterbury, were in constant or occasional correspondence with the exiled princes. Their prospects had brightened when James II. died in 1701. His folly and bigotry were covered by the grave, and it was hoped that his son James would profit by his example, and eschew that obstinacy which brought his grandfather to the block and his father to ruin. The prince was tall and of noble bearing, his manners were refined, his address easy and agreeable. The Scotch were galled and irritated by the Act of Union passed in 1707, and looked to Prince James as one who might prove the champion and restorer of their national independence. The Irish beheld in him an adherent of their ancient faith, and the English non-jurors had never withdrawn, and never could conscientiously withdraw, their allegiance from the hereditary Stuarts. Moreover, at the death-bed of James II., the great and mighty Louis XIV. had solemnly recognised Prince James as king, in violation of the treaty of Ryswick,‡ and promised him protection and support.

But the Prince was not gifted with remarkable talents, and his natural defects were not supplied by firmness of character and a good education. His frivolous tutors never taught him the art of government and the complex nature of the British Constitution. In 1708 a fleet and army equipped by the French,

* Klose, *Memoirs of the Count of Albany*, vol. i. 43.
† Russell's *Modern Europe*, iv. 395.
‡ 20th September, 1697.

sailed from Dunkirk, with a view to restoring James to the throne of his ancestors, but they never effected a landing in Scotland. The Chevalier de St. George, as the Pope* styled Prince James on the occasion of this enterprise, was compelled to return to France, and a reward of £100,000 was offered for his head. In official documents he was described as the Pretender, and the better to merit it, he served as a volunteer in a campaign in the Netherlands. He besought his sister, the Queen of England, to accomplish the vows of the clergy of the Church of England, and secure to him the reversion of the crown at her demise. He could not be prevailed upon to declare his conversion to the Anglican Religion, but promised, as his father had faithlessly done before him, to respect the rights and privileges of the Established Church. The word of sovereigns and the treaties they sign are too often worthy of little trust. Having broken the treaty of Ryswick, Louis pledged himself anew to the House of Hanover at the peace of Utrecht,† while he ceased not, either privately or openly, to favour the House of Stuart and encourage its designs. The situation of Queen Anne became more and more embarrassing, caught as she was in the meshes of Whig and Tory, Hanoverian and Jacobite intrigues. From these, however, she was relieved by death in 1714, and exclaimed when dying, "Oh, my dear brother, how I pity you!"

But her known attachment to Prince James's cause did not prevent the peaceable succession of George of Denmark to the throne. His advent changed the face of affairs. Walpole and Townshend, the Whig leaders, came into power; Oxford, Bolingbroke, and Ormond, the Tory and Jacobite chiefs, were impeached. Lord Mar was ejected from office, and, driven back to his native mountains, raised the Highland Clans under the standard of James III. The fiery cross fled from chieftain to chieftain, and the gathering was great. But the battle of Sheriffmuir was a defeat rather than a victory, and the arrival of Prince James himself at Peterhead‡ did not avail to retrieve the disaster. His face was gloomy, his words were desponding, his attendance on Roman Catholic worship was too punctilious for his interests, and his whole demeanour was wanting in that daring which the enterprise required. Affecting to march forward, he escaped on board a small vessel prepared to receive him and sailed away with the Earl of Mar, leaving his followers to disband and make the best terms they

* John Francis Aldani. Clement XI.
† April 11th, 1712.
‡ December 22nd, 1715. Letter of James to Bolingbroke.

could for their liberties and lives. "It was not," as Prince Eugene said, "by weeping and wailing that kingdoms were to be won." James was often seen in tears before his flight, and a medal perpetuated the memory of his weakness by the inscription:

"Bis venit, vidit, non vicit, flensque recessit."

The want of wisdom and strength of character was a part of the misfortune of his line. In virtue of the Treaty of Utrecht, the English Government insisted that he should not be allowed to reside in Lorraine; he resorted, therefore, to Avignon, under the protection of the Pope, and thence removed to Rome, where he was honoured as a king. His claim to the throne was still a great card to be played. The astute Alberoni made the most of it, and with his alliance and support, Charles XII. of Sweden was to invade Scotland with 10,000 men. But Charles XII. died,* and James repaired to Madrid to concert some other plan of invasion with the wily minister.† A Spanish fleet was fitted out, and an army embarked under the command of the Duke of Ormond. But the winds and waves have ever protected Old England against the Spaniards; and two frigates only made their way to the Scottish coast, disembarked their troops, and added one more disappointment to the long list over which the Stuarts had to mourn. *Il n'y a aucun exemple dans l'histoire d'une maison si long-temps infortunée.*‡

But we now come to Prince James's marriage with the lady who was to be mother of Cardinal York. Clementina, grand-daughter of John Sobieski, King of Poland, who defeated the Turks before Vienna, was accounted one of the richest heiresses in Europe; and if the Emperor of Germany did not openly favour the project of her union with Prince James, it was because King George just at that period supported with a fleet the Emperor's claims on Sicily. When, therefore, she secretly set off for Italy with her mother, in 1718, she was detained in the Tyrol by the Emperor's orders, and her father also, Prince Sobieski, was placed under arrest. Prince James was at Milan, on the way to meet his affianced, when he heard of her imprisonment. It lasted nine months. At the end of that time, Clementina was allowed to escape, and was assisted in her flight by Charles Wogan, a faithful friend of the Stuarts. On arriving at Bologna, in May, 1719,

* December 11th, 1718. † March 26th, 1719.

‡ *Siècle de Louis XV.* See also Frederick Von Raumer, *Elizabeth und Maria.*

she was married to Prince James by proxy, and in September following the bridegroom returned from Spain, met his bride at Montefiascone, and in November conducted her to Rome, as gladly as might be under the pressure of adverse fortune.

On the last day of the ensuing year, 1720, Clementina gave birth to her first child—the brave and unfortunate Prince Charles Edward, Count of Albany. Remembering what suspicions had been cast on his own parentage, in consequence of King James II. not having assembled sufficiently credible witnesses around the bed of Mary of Modena at his birth,* Prince James invited seven Cardinals, fourteen English noblemen, and two hundred persons, in all, of high rank, to be present at the birth of his child in Rome. All the pomp and splendour of royalty encircled the prince's cradle. The very midwife was made a countess, and a pension of five hundred scudi was settled upon her. The palace of the Santi Apostoli at St. Albano, was granted to James and his descendants, while the treasures of the Holy See, the Cardinals, and the Spanish Court, were poured in lavish abundance into the lap of the exiled claimant to the throne of England. The birth of another Stuart heir was hailed by the Jacobites with joy disproportioned to his chance of regaining the forfeited inheritance. The firing of canon from the castle of St. Angelo, the medals struck, the Te Deums chanted, the titles conferred, only impressed the more strongly on thoughtful minds the sad and unhopeful features of the case.

The married life of Prince James and Clementina was not without alloy. The education of their son, Prince Charles, was entrusted to the Earl and Countess of Inverness, who being, together with Lord Murray the Countess's brother, Protestants, were thought by Clementina very unfit persons to have charge of so august a child. Her maternal heart was wounded by her eldest son being wholly withdrawn from her superintendence; and in addition to this sorrow her feelings as a wife and a woman were outraged by the real or supposed infidelity of her husband. Lady Inverness is spoken of in her letters without reserve as "the King's mistress."† She trusted that Prince Charles would one day be a crowned champion of the Ancient Faith, and she mourned in secret over the dangers to which he was exposed in early years by an unsound education and immoral preceptors.

Such was the divided state of Prince Charles's home when,

* Macaulay, vol. iii. 179.

† Clementina to her father, November 15th, 1725. Elizabeth of Spain to Clementina, December 29th, 1725.

on the 20th of March, 1725, his brother Henry Benedict was born. He was created Duke of York and St. Albano by his father, and subsequently, when enjoying a cardinalate, maintained in his own person the Stuart claim to the throne of these kingdoms. Not many months after his birth the differences between Prince James and his consort rose to such a height that the latter quitted her husband's palace, and retired to the Benedictine convent of St. Cecilia. She had thoughts of returning to her native land; and the Prince had informed her father that he was at liberty to take her away. The Popes, however, were anxious to prevent a decided rupture; a show of mutual regard was still kept up; Clementina was visited once by her husband while residing in the convent; and the children were sometimes taken to see her. The Cardinals, with the French and Spanish Courts, united their efforts to those of Innocent XIII. and Benedict XIII. to procure a reconciliation, and this, or something of the kind, was effected in October 1726.*

It lasted, however, but a short time; nor was it till the following year that the chief cause of disagreement was removed in the person of Lady Inverness. By the earnest advice of Cardinal Alberoni, Prince Sobieski, and the Pope, this lady was at last finally dismissed; and Miss Walpole, a Roman Catholic, being appointed in her place, Clementina consented to renew her domestic relations with James. It was not long before her husband gave her fresh ground for jealousy; but the little Prince continued to be instructed by members of his own Church. The highest notions of royal prerogative were instilled into his and his brother's mind, and it was not till after the expedition of Prince Charles in 1745 that the Duke of York decided on embracing an ecclesiastical life. So long as there were good hopes of his family recovering the crown, he seems to have preferred the career of a secular prince; he was willing even to take arms in his father's cause;† and would probably have thought it unwise to disqualify himself more than ever from reigning over England by being tonsured and saying mass. In his mother Clementina, he had before him a constant example of fervent attachment to the Roman Church, and the lessons of maternal piety sank deep into his memory. His vows of celibacy were taken over her tomb, and though he never distinguished himself by remarkable talents as a churchman, he at least avoided bringing any scandal on the clerical order. It was

* C. L. Klose. *Memoirs of Prince Charles Stuart*, i. 97.
† Chambers' Cyclopædia, art. Stuarts.

his misfortune to lose his mother when ten years old. After many sorrows, and suffering severely from asthma during several years, she died in January 1735, and was translated from a shadowy Court on earth to the higher and purer splendours of a heavenly inheritance.

We are not without some notices of the manner of life pursued by Prince James and his sons, while holding their little Court at Rome after the death of Clementina. We can even tell what *Monsieur le Duc de York* had for supper on the 10th of September, 1733; what his Royal Highness Prince Charles Edward ate; and the many additional dishes which were set before the King, James III.* But there are other particulars respecting their Court-life which deserve better to be recorded. The President des Brosses, who was in Rome in 1740, tells us that Prince James was treated with as much respect as though he had been a real sovereign. His residence was Palazzo Muti in the Piazza dei Santi Apostoli. The Pope's soldiers mounted guard there as at Monte Cavallo, and attended him whenever he went out. He had the air of a Stuart, being tall and thin, and in face like the portraits of his father, James II. The dignity of his bearing was remarkable, but his countenance was at the same time silly and sad. Grace and nobility were in all his movements; yet he appeared in the saloons for a short time only when he gave an entertainment. Though he had quarrelled with his wife during her lifetime, he lamented over her when dead, and passed whole mornings in prayer near her tomb in the Church of the Holy Apostles. His dinner-table was usually laid with covers for himself and the ten members of his household; but if a Roman or foreign gentleman waited on him in the morning, he commonly invited him to dinner, in which case a corresponding number of his attendants removed to a side-table. As soon as he had sat down, his two sons, Prince Charles and the Duke of York, used to go and kneel before him, asking his blessing. The faces of both bore the family traits, but the latter, then fifteen years of age, was decidedly handsome. Amiable and graceful in manners, they were, notwithstanding, less cultivated than young princes usually are, and they showed but moderate abilities. Both delighted in music; Prince Charles played the violoncello, and the Duke sang Italian airs in very good taste. There was a concert at the palace once a week, and there the best music in Rome might be heard. Of course all the English

* *Stuart Papers.* Souper du Roi, 10 Sepre. 1733. Stanhope's *Hist.* vol. ii. App.

who visited the eternal city were anxious to see the Princes, and the Duke of York, it would seem, was especially admired. The elder brother was thought to have most in him, and to be as kind as he was courageous. He felt deeply the misfortunes of his house, and words escaped him now and then which proved that he meditated an invasion of England sooner or later.* When quite a boy he had taken an active part in the siege of Gaeta by the Spaniards, and accompanied the Duke of Berwick into the trenches, "where he appeared quite regardless of the bullets that were whistling about them."†

The Duke of York had heard much of his father's attempt to regain the crown of England in 1715, and he looked forward with intense interest to the day when his brother would reassert in arms the claims of their house. That day at length arrived; and Prince Charles, with the Pope's blessing on his head, started on his dangerous enterprise. In all his letters he mentioned his brother, Henry of York, with the utmost tenderness, and he used himself to be addressed by James as "My dearest Carluccio." Father and sons alike looked on their cause as sacred; and just before Prince Charles sailed for Scotland we find him writing to his father from Navarre,‡ and saying: "I made my devotions on Pentecost Day, recommending myself particularly to the Almighty on this occasion to guide and direct me, and to continue to me always the same sentiments, which are to suffer anything rather than fail in any of my duties." Prince Henry himself was sent in 1745 to lead an army assembled at Dunkirk for the invasion of England,§ but before he could effect his object, his plans were disconcerted by the sad defeat of the Highland army at Culloden. The roar of that battle was the death-knell of the Stuart cause. The grief it caused to Prince James and his friends was the more poignant because the first efforts of the Highlanders had been crowned with success; because Edinburgh had opened its gates to them; because they had marched triumphant through Dumfries, Carlisle, Leek, Ashbourne and Derby, and might, if their chiefs had been united and resolute, have taken possession of the capital, and have expelled the Hanoverian dynasty, for a time at least, from the seat of power. The meeting of Prince Charles and Prince Henry after the final overthrow must have

* *L'Italie il y a Cent Ans*, vol. ii. 93—100.

† Duke of Berwick to the Duke of Fitzjames.

‡ June 12, 1745. *Stuart Papers.*

§ Chambers' Cyclopædia, art. Henry Benedict, Duke and Cardinal of York.

been painful indeed. The following letter of the Duke of York to his father refers to this subject. It shows much feeling, and that of the right sort.

"Clichy, October 17, 1746.

"The very morning after I writ you my last, I had the happiness of meeting with my dearest brother. He did not know me at first sight, but I am sure I knew him very well, for he is not in the least altered since I saw him, except grown somewhat broader and fatter, which is incomprehensible after all the fatigues he has endured. Your Majesty may conceive better than I can express in writing the tenderness of our first meeting. Those that were present said they never saw the like in their lives; and indeed I defy the whole world to show another brother so kind and loving as he is to me. For my part, I can safely say that all my endeavours tend to no other end but that of deserving so much goodness as he has for me. . . . . The Prince sees and will scarce see anybody but myself for a few days, that he may have a little time to rest before he is plagued by all the world, as to be sure he will, when once he sees company. I go every day to dine with him. Yesterday I brought him privately to see my house; and I perceive he has as much *gôut* for the chase as ever he had. Most humbly asking your Majesty's blessing, I remain,

"Your most dutiful Son,

"HENRY."

Notwithstanding the strong affection for Prince Charles expressed by the Duke of York, a certain coldness and reserve on the part of the latter was complained of by his gallant and unfortunate brother.* This distance was increased when Henry proceeded to Rome, took holy orders, was made priest, and invested with the purple by Benedict XIV. in 1747. The step was highly injurious to the Stuart cause, and so sure to displease Prince Charles that the knowledge of it was withheld from him to the last moment, in order to prevent his remonstrance.† When at last it came to his ears, his anger was beyond control, and it was increased by the fact of his brother having quitted Paris for Rome without giving him any notice of his design, and by his father having concurred in his promotion to the cardinalate. The Jacobites in general declared that it was a worse blow to their party than the battle of Culloden, and it led to Prince Charles breaking off all correspondence with the Cardinal, and writing to his father in a brief, cold, and constrained manner. It may be that

* Earl Stanhope's *History*, vol. iii. 166.

† James to Prince Charles, June 13, 1747.

Prince Henry preferred the certain dignity of a princedom of the Roman Church, to the uncertain and more than ever improbable dignities that awaited him in the event of his family regaining the throne. A letter written by Prince James to "Carluccio" in June 1747 leaves no doubt of his being convinced that the younger brother had long been following a vocation to the priesthood. He was, he said, "so fully convinced of the sincerity and solidity of Henry's vocation that he should think it a resisting the will of God, and acting directly against his conscience, if he should pretend to restrain him in a matter which so nearly concerned himself." We have, therefore, under all the circumstances, abundant reason to believe that Cardinal York, like Cardinal Howard before him, was led to an ecclesiastical life by the highest and purest motives; and we cannot but honour him for the choice he made, though we may regret that he was not more open on the subject with his brother, to whom he owed the utmost respect, and from whom he had received so many marks of sincere affection.

Years rolled by, nineteen long and wearisome years for the Stuarts. The strength of the Hanoverian dynasty steadily increased, and the prospects of Prince James coming to the throne grew more and more dim. In 1766 he died, leaving behind him the memory of his feeble talents and constant piety. Young George III. was then in the height of his popularity, and Prince Charles, the Stuart heir, succeeded only to an empty title. He had long been wandering from land to land, living in close retirement, and harassed alike by British spies, and Governments on the continent favourable to British interests. Disappointment and depraved habits had driven him to frequent intoxication, and made him the wreck of his former self. In this condition, the Minister of Louis XV. contrived for him a marriage with Louise, Princess of Stolberg, whose influence, it was hoped, would be added to that of Cardinal York in bringing about a reformation in his mode of life. It was in April, 1772, that the marriage between the *royal* pair was celebrated at Macerata,* and a medal struck on the occasion was inscribed in Latin: Charles III., born 1720, King of England, France, and Ireland, 1766. Louise, Queen of England, France, and Ireland, 1772. Five days after the wedding, Charles and his "Queen" made a public entry into Rome. Four outriders led the way. The carriages, of which there were five, were each drawn by six horses. Cardinal York took part in the pageant, and presented his

* Taillandier, *Comtesse d'Albany*, p. 37.

sister-in-law with a box set with brilliants in which was a draft for 20,000 Roman crowns.

But if any ray of happiness played about the nuptials, it was soon dispersed. Prince Charles's intemperance increased, and so far from appreciating his wife's accomplishments, he grew brutal and violent towards her. It was impossible to live with him. He became like a satyr in the woods, and besides being jealously watched, her life was in danger. She formed a strong attachment for the poet Alfieri, and deserted an unworthy husband for a lover, who, though unhappily devoid of Christian principles, was full, at least, of genius and affection. Cardinal York approved, in the kindest of letters,* her separation from his brother, but of the influence of Alfieri in the matter he was uninformed, or thought proper to ignore it. The friendship existing between them might, so far as he knew, be virtuous, and based upon literary and artistic sympathies. He hoped, he said, that happier circumstances might lead eventually to her rejoining the prince, but without a miracle being wrought, there was no fear his ever advising it. What God had permitted to happen might prove the means of his brother's conversion; but in any case it would afford her the opportunity of leading an edifying life, and thus vindicating the purity and justice of her cause in the eyes of the world. He had lost no time in communicating with the holy Father respecting her affairs, and nothing could exceed the kindness with which he had consented to every plan proposed for her comfort. The convent of the Ursulines, where her mother-in-law had once resided, was offered her as an asylum, and she well knew how much freedom she might there enjoy.

Madame D'Albany had no thought of remaining long in the convent, she soon removed to the beautiful palace of the Cancellaria, constructed by Bramante. It was the abode of Cardinal York; but he was absent the greater part of the year, engaged in his duties as Bishop of Frascati. Here Alfieri often visited her; but the good Cardinal, who had recently attended his brother during a dangerous illness at Florence, and had heard more than he knew before of Alfieri's attentions, discountenanced the poet's visits, and perhaps aided in the means employed for banishing him from Rome. He drew up likewise a deed of separation *a mensâ et thoro*, which was agreed upon by Prince Charles and the Countess, and subsequently had the happiness of being reconciled to the brother from whom he had been more or less estranged since

* Cardinal York to the Countess of Albany, Frascati, December 15th, 1780.

he had decided on embracing an ecclesiastical life.* Their reconciliation was effected chiefly by Prince Charles's illegitimate daughter, the Duchess of Albany. Her father's health was completely broken. He came to Rome to die. Rome is the grave of the Stuarts—the last resting place of England's wandering and throneless kings. If their noble line must perish, where could it find a more suitable and sacred mausoleum? Whatever they lost, kingdoms, treasures and friends, they had the merit at least of clinging to the Faith of their fathers.

In January, 1788, Prince Charles died, and his remains were deposited in the Cathedral of Frascati. His brother, the Bishop, besides being a Cardinal, attained to a variety of other dignities. He was Bishop of Ostia and Velletri, Vice-Chancellor of the Roman Church, and Archpriest of the Vatican Basilica. He received from the King of France several wealthy abbeys, and was thus able to maintain considerable state, and throw some lustre round the expiring honours of his house. He was a prominent member of Roman society to the end of the last century, and though he is said to have thanked God, like his father and grandfather, for having deprived him of three kingdoms, he also, like them, asserted plainly his claim to the crown of which Providence deprived him. According to the precedents of the Roman hierarchy, he should have resigned the Cardinal's hat or the title of Majesty.† But this he avoided; nor can he be blamed for retaining a dignity which he really prized, while for form's sake he preferred a shadowy claim to a lost inheritance. On the death of his brother he caused a medal to be struck, with the inscription, *Henricus IX. Magn. Brit. Franciæ et Hibern. Rex, Fid. Def. Card. Ep. Tusc.* It also bears the motto, *Non desideriis hominum, sed voluntate Dei.* One of these medals was given by the Cardinal to Lord Cloncurry,‡ and another is in the possession of Queen Victoria.§ To the last, Cardinal York insisted, in his own house, on the formalities customary in the residence of a reigning prince, and with these even the Duke of Sussex complied when he visited the Cardinal, as he did frequently on familiar terms. In addressing him, indeed, he adopted a middle term—"your royal highness,"—and was on this account less a favourite with his Eminence than Lord Cloncurry, who did not scruple to humour him by saying "your Majesty."‖ Even in his

* *New Review*, October, 1863.
† Klose, vol. ii. 248.
‡ See his *Autobiography*.
§ Klose. Appendix. No. V.
‖ *Personal Recollections of Lord Cloncurry*, 172.

will he asserted the Stuart claims, requiring that his regal title should be graven on his tomb, and solemnly bequeathing his rights to the British throne to Victor Emanuel, King of Sardinia, who abdicated in 1821.

The pension allowed to the Cardinal by the English Government, to which we have already alluded, amounted to £4,000 a year. In 1796 his Eminence disposed of all the family jewels, and, among them, of a ruby, the largest and most perfect known, which was valued at £50,000, in order to assist Pope Pius VI. in making up the sum exacted from him by Bonaparte. He thus deprived himself of independent means, and when Pius VI. and his court were expelled from Rome by the despot of Europe, the Cardinal was reduced to great distress. A French revolutionary banditti drove him from the villa near Rome where he had lived in quiet and dignified retirement. His life was in danger, and though infirm as well as poor, he was compelled to fly to Venice in 1798. Here Cardinal Borgia undertook to represent his case to the English Government, and a memorial was laid before George III. by Mr. Dundas, afterwards Lord Melville. His Majesty was touched by the account he heard of Cardinal York's distress; and the former splendour of his line united with his unblemished reputation and generous sacrifices in producing a most favourable impression on the royal mind.* He resolved to aid him, and to pardon or ignore the fact of his having always claimed a title to the throne of England. He well knew that, in doing so, the Cardinal acted only in accordance with family traditions, and that he had not the remotest idea of attempting to disturb the peace of this country. He was a studious prelate, well informed, and sincerely pious. While he had the means, his purse was always open to the poor, and British travellers in particular found in him a munificent host and a kind benefactor. His villa was stored with valuable curiosities, and his library was enriched with many rare and interesting MSS. relating to the unfortunate House of Stuart. Of these and every other comfort he was now deprived, driven from his diocese into exile, a victim of godless revolution and unscrupulous despotism. A worthier subject of the King of England's bounty could hardly be found.

Yet the pension granted to Cardinal York by George III. was not altogether a gratuity. It was given ostensibly in consideration of a debt claimed by Maria d'Este, the Queen of James II., and secured to her by the treaty of Ryswick.

* Sir John Cox Hippesley to Cardinal York, March 31, 1800.

Several fruitless attempts had been made by Prince Charles to recover the arrears of his grandmother's jointure, which jointure alone amounted to 50,000*l.* The difficulty in obtaining these by a legal process would have been insuperable, but the fact of there being such a claim of long standing on the part of the Stuart heirs, afforded the King of England an opportunity of doing as an act of justice what he wished to do as an act of benevolence.*

In 1801 Cardinal York returned to Rome. Again he enjoyed his villa at Frascati, and derived a sufficient income from his benefices and his pension. He had many equipages, and freely placed them at the disposal of his guests. Lord Cloncurry visited him frequently in the years 1803, 1804, and 1805. He speaks of him with respect almost amounting to affection, and tells us some amusing anecdotes respecting his private life. Being an invalid and under strict regimen, his servants were often obliged to tantalise him as the physicians did Sancho Panza in the governorship of Baratavia. He retained his taste for savoury meats, and when a rich dish was set before him, they would snatch it away, while he strove in vain to seize it in the transit. One of his favourite attendants was a cur dog, which attached itself to him one day at the gate of St. Peter's. The Cardinal often referred to this occurrence as a proof of the animal's sagacity and instinct; for being, as he supposed, a King Charles's spaniel, he had scented the true royal blood of the House of Stuart, and clung to its last heir as his master and friend.

It was on the 13th of July, 1807, that this amiable prince —the last Stuart King of England, "if right hereditary be right divine,"—departed in peace.† High above the Lake of Albano rises the lofty height of Monte Cavo, where Juno, according to Virgil, sat to view the armies contending on the Latian plain. Here, upon the spot where Tarquin built a shrine to Jupiter, Cardinal York erected that solid, sombre monastery, where Passionists devote their lives to God amid the sublimity of mountain solitudes. It is a monument to his zeal and piety which the storms of ages will hardly shake, and Time will not easily crumble. It reminds the traveller through some of the most exquisite scenery that eye can behold, of the existence of something in man himself more beautiful and ornate than the visible universe; of a religion which, when unblurred by sin and error, is a transcript of the Eternal Mind, a changeless creed, an everlasting worship, a divine cere-

* Lord Minto to Cardinal York, February 9, 1800. Stuart Papers.
† C. L. Klose, *Memoirs of Prince Charles Stuart*, ii. 250.

monial, an acceptable service. The Stuart claims, though lofty and worldly, died out in accents of penitence, prayer, and praise. The doubtful splendours of Holyrood, Dublin Castle,* and St. James's, were exchanged for the sacred twilight of the Tombs of the Apostles. The spectacle of King George III. on the throne of England may be more attractive to the eye of history, but religion will look with deeper interest on the Cathedral of Frascati, the Passionist convent on Monte Cavo, and the choir of St. Peter's, where the aged and venerable representative of a long line of kings beat his breast before the altar, plunged deep in divine meditation, or chanted, in the mystic language of the psalter, the sufferings and triumphs of the universal Church.

To the English Government the Cardinal bequeathed his papers in grateful remembrance of the King of England's kindness. They were long kept in the safe custody of the royal librarian, and were largely used by the Rev. J. S. Clarke in his life of James II.† The prince regent, afterwards George IV., in 1819 caused a stately monument from Canova's chisel to be erected in St. Peter's at Rome to the memory of the exiled princes who had, during more than a century, disputed the Hanoverian claim. The likenesses of Prince James, Charles, and Henry, appear on it in bas-relief, executed in white marble, and the following inscription does honour alike to him who devised it and those for whom it was devised. It is a seal of their mutual goodwill, respect, and forgiveness, such as makes an indelible impression on every thoughtful Englishman who enters the marvellous dome of St. Peter's, and reads:—

JACOBO III., JACOBI II., MAGN. BRIT. REGIS, FILIO,
CAROLO EDUARDO ET HENRICO, DECANO
PATRUM CARDINALIUM, JACOBI III. FILIIS,
REGIÆ STIRPIS STUARDIÆ POSTREMIS.
ANNO MDCCCXIX.
BEATI MORTUI QUI IN DOMINO MORIUNTUR.

* See Macaulay, chap. xii. 1689.
† 2 vols. 4to. Klose, vol. ii. p. 250, note by Editor.

ART. XXIII.—*New America.* By WILLIAM HEPWORTH DIXON. Two Vols. London: Hurst and Blackett. 1867.

SECOND ARTICLE.

IN our remarks upon Mormonism, we did not touch upon that which strikes Englishmen generally as its great characteristic —polygamy. We did not do so, because we intend in our present article to speak of the state of things in the older states, which inevitably leads, and has led, to its adoption. Those who wish to know more about it can consult Mr. Dixon's pages, where he treats the matter pretty fully: it is an unpleasant subject, and one which we gladly avoid as far as we can. We do not think that the prospect of a plurality of wives has much to do with drawing converts, either men or women, to the Salt Lake Valley: we feel quite sure, that Mormonism would be equally a success without it; nay, we go further; we believe that after Brigham Young's death, if not before, this very institution will cause a division, perhaps a break-up of the community. Of one thing we are certain, that it causes a degradation of women unknown in Europe, and is fast bringing them into that low social condition which we see in Mohammedan countries. The Mormons are not, however, the only persons who are bringing about a revolution in the status of women; it is steadily going on throughout the whole continent of the United States; and what is more, it is the work of women themselves. It is true, that they are endeavouring to raise themselves into a state of equality with men; but it will be seen that the very fact of the attempt on their part, since it is an attempt to alter the position of woman, which is assigned to her by the Creator, leads inevitably to her own degradation; no one can reverse the order of divine Providence without injury to those who attempt it. A wholly artificial life is that aimed at in the older states; motherhood and home duties are contemned as degrading; children are a clog and an incumbrance, which a wife tries to rid herself of; to talk of them to a mother, as we are accustomed to do in England, is considered an insult, which a woman will not endure. This anxiety to be childless leads to darker crimes, which Mr. Dixon only hints at.

The following is a specimen of the sentiments which are now gaining such a strong hold on the female mind in America. It is a conversation between a lady of Rhode Island and the author. The lady speaks:—

"A woman's first duty is to look beautiful in the eyes of men, so that she may attract them to her side, and exert an influence over them for good; not to be a household drudge, a slave in the nursery, the kitchen, and the schoolroom. Everything that spoils a woman in this respect is against her true interest, and she has a right to reject it, as a man would reject an impost that was unjustly laid on his gains. A wife's first thought should be for her husband, and for herself as his companion in the world. Nothing should ever be allowed to come between these two.' I ventured to ask the lady, her husband sitting by, whether children do come between father and mother; saying that I had two boys and three girls of my own, and had never suspected such a thing. 'They do,' she answered boldly, 'they take up the mother's time, they impair her beauty, and they waste her life. If you walk down these streets' (the streets of Providence), 'you will notice a hundred delicate girls just blushing into womanhood; in a year they will be married; in ten years they will be hags and crones. No man will care for them, on the score of beauty. Their husbands will find no lustre in their eyes, no bloom upon their cheeks. They will have given up their lives to their children.'"—Vol. ii. pp. 266, 267.

This is no private opinion of one lady, it is an acknowledged fact.

"The fact that many of these delicate and sparkling women do not care to have their rooms full of rosy darlings is not a matter of inference. Allusions to the nursery, such as in England and Germany would be taken by a young wife as compliments, are here received with a smile, accompanied with a shrug of undoubted meaning. You must not wish an American lady, in whose graces you desire to stand, many happy returns of a christening day; she might resent the wish as an offence: indeed I have known a young and pretty woman rise from a table and leave the room on hearing such a favour expressed towards her by an English guest."—Vol. ii. p. 269.

As they have sown so they reap: they are what they wish to become:

"Strangest of all strange things is the example set to the rest of these States by Massachusetts, the religious centre of New England, the intellectual light of the United States. In Massachusetts the young women marry, but they seldom become mothers. The women have made themselves companions to their husbands, brilliant, subtle, and fair companions. At the same time the power of New England is passing over to the populous west, and a majority of the rising generation of Boston is either of German or Irish birth."—P. 271.

Having thus destroyed the proper duties of home and family, having degraded the very idea of a mother, it naturally follows that the position of woman in the eastern States, at least, of America, is wholly changed; she becomes a different being, with a different purpose of existence from what we understand in our more Christian country. Women are beginning to wear men's clothes, and to undertake men's duties; one practises as a physician, another is ordained a 'minister,' another aspires to a seat in the Legislature. These notions are carried out into the smallest matters: a deputation of ladies in New England went up to their clergyman's house to protest against the wording of the exhortation at matins, "Dearly beloved *brethren*," as implying that woman was counted for nothing. The clergyman adroitly replied that there was no need for alteration, as the *brethren always embrace the sisters.*

The result of this *boulversement* of natural and divine order manifests itself in the formation of the wildest and most extravagant sects; starting from one idea, but diverging into the most opposite directions. Let us hear first Eliza Farnham, prophetess of the new order of "Revolt of Woman;" in which woman is set up as in every respect superior to man. We shall not enter into a lengthened description of her creed, it will be sufficient to give her version of the Fall. In it

"Eve is not weak, but strong. She finds Adam in bonds, and she sets him free. He is bound by a bad law to live in a state of darkness and bondage, a mere animal life, without knowing good from evil. She breaks his fetters, and shews him the way to heaven. The consequences of her art are noble; and through her courage man did not fall, but rise. She did 'a great service to humanity' when she plucked the forbidden fruit.

"In the details of the Fall, Eliza finds much comfort, when she can read them by her own inward light—Wisdom (in the form of a serpent), addressed the woman, not the man, who would have cared little for the tree of knowledge. The temptation offered to her was spiritual. She took the forbidden fruit in the hope of becoming wiser and diviner than she had been before. Man followed her. Yes; the ascendency of woman began in Paradise!"—P. 207.

We cannot resist the desire to quote from S. Epiphanius (Adv. Hær. i. § 30), an account of a Gnostic Gospel, which shows that Eliza has been anticipated in her heresy. "Some of them produce a certain spurious and forged composition (ποίημα), to which they give the name of "The Gospel of

Perfection;" others have the impudence to call it, "The Gospel of Eve," for they propagate their principles under her name as having found the name of wisdom (τὸ ὄνομα τῆς γνώσεως), from the revelations of the serpent who spoke to her."

The votaries of this revived heresy, for votaries of it are to be found in every populous city of the United States, announce that the reign of science is over, and that of spiritualism has begun:

"Science is the offspring of men, spiritualism of woman. The first is gross and sensual, a thing of the past; the second is pure and holy, a thing of the future. Science doubts, spiritualism believes; one is of the earth, the other is of heaven. Now that the Gospel of Women is declared, Science has ceased to have a leading part in the discovery of truth; the objective world is about to pass into the subjective, and the superior sex will read for us, by their inner light, the mysteries of heaven and hell."—p. 201.

Eliza's sect may be small, but the ideas of the rights of woman are very largely diffused. One result is certain to follow, and it has followed, the repudiation of the obligation of marriage, and a denial of its sanctity. There cannot be two independent heads in one household, any more than there can be two Presidents at the head of the civil government. These women have done their best to dethrone the husband from being "the head of the wife," but they have not yet succeeded in explaining how a household is to be conducted without its head. Two ways are open for experiments in this dilemma, a community of wives, and an enforced celibacy. Both these have examples in the United States. The founder of the communists is John Humphreys Noyes; he has three societies at Oneida, Wallingford, and Brooklyn. He was a lawyer's clerk, who was much affected by the great revival of '31; and became a religious fanatic. He went to college at Andover, and to Yale, at New Haven, where he became "a seeker after truth;" a description which really means that he determined to invent a new religion, and devise a new community. All this time, being a man of strong animal passions, he indulged in the lusts of the flesh without restraint. His work was to reconcile immorality with the Bible: he finds it in the teaching of S. Paul, and amounts to this:—

"A Perfectionist knows no law; neither that pronounced from Sinai, and repeated from Gerizim, nor that which is administered in Washington and New York. He does not live under law, but under God: that is to say, under what his own

mind prompts him to do, as being right. The Lord has made him free. To him the word is nothing, its force having been wholly spent for him at the Second Coming. No commandment in the ten, no statute on the rolls, is binding upon him, —a child of grace, delivered from the power of the law and from the stain of sin. Laws are for sinners—he is a saint. Other men fall into temptation—he is sealed and reclaimed by the Holy Ghost."—Pp. 224, 225.

He soon finds a woman who is ready to adopt his opinions, he writes to her a love-letter explaining his proposals: it is in effect to form a society in which community of wives, or rather of women—for they have no marriage ceremony,—and community of goods, are the principal features.

Mr. Dixon confesses it to be a difficulty to convey a description of this plan, and of the principles which govern it, in decent language, we may therefore be spared saying more ourselves, excepting this, that from what we can gather from our author's pages, the settlement at Oneida Creek with its three hundred members, is a *fornix* on an unprecedentedly gigantic scale.

It is worth while, however, to give the testimony of one who is a leader in a community of a totally different character:—

"'You may expect to see the Bible Families increase very fast,' said Elder Frederick, who looks upon their growth with anything but a friendly eye; 'they meet the desires of a great many men and women who are fantastic; giving, in the name of religious service, a free rein to the passions, with a deep sense of repose. Women find in them a great field for the affections. The Bible Communists give a pious charter to Free Love, and the sentiment of Free Love is rooted in the heart of New York."—P. 263.

Let our readers ponder the last sentence of Elder Frederick's words, there is something appalling in the confession; it betrays a degradation for which we were not prepared. Like the other sects, we shall find its counterpart in some Gnostic heresy: every peculiarity can be paralleled, every notion identified. S. Epiphanius gives us the following description of the teaching of Carpocras, a native of Alexandria (Adv. Hæres. xxvii. § 5). That in order to arrive at God who is above us, it is necessary to fulfil all the works of the world, and of lust . . . . that the soul which resists its lust is punished for it, by passing after death into another body, and another, until lust was fulfilled. That therefore the most certain way is to pay that debt as soon as possible, by fulfilling

in the body all the works of the flesh. That nothing is good or evil in itself, but only in the opinion of men. They abhorred fasting, they indulged in all kinds of meat and drink; they repudiate marriage, holding a community of women. It is time to leave these infamous Gnostics, and follow Elder Frederick to a community of a different character.

From open licentiousness, from the overturning of order in families, from the revolt of woman, and all attendant evils, we shall not be surprised to find a strong reaction. Accordingly, we are taken to Mount Lebanon, the home of the "Shaker Union." A more delightful picture of peace, order, and contentment, it is impossible to conceive, than reigns in this home. "Life," says our author, "seems to move in an easy kind of rhythm. Order, temperance, frugality, worship,—these are the Shaker things which strike upon your senses first; the peace and innocence of Eden, when contrasted with the wrack and riot of New York. Every one seems busy, every one tranquil . . . . no soldiers, no police, no judges live here; and among the members of a society, in which every man stakes his all, appeal to the courts of law is unknown."

"Their Church is based on these grand ideas:—The Kingdom of Heaven has come; Christ has actually appeared on earth; the personal rule of God has been restored. In the wake of these ideas, dependent upon them, follow many more:—the old law is abolished, the command to multiply has ceased; Adam's sin has been atoned; the intercourse of heaven and earth has been restored; the curse is taken away from labour; the earth and all that is on it will be redeemed; angels and spirits have become, as of old, familiars and ministers of men. . . . . .

"In the firm belief of these people, the call which they obey is not a mere change of life, but a new life of the soul, in which the world has no share. Birth and marriage are at an end; death itself has become to them only a change of dress, a shedding of the visible robe of the flesh for an invisible glory of the spirit."—Pp. 103, 104.

We have before paralleled the doctrines of the disciples of Free Love with those of certain Gnostics; we can find a similar parallel to those who repudiate marriage, and the procreation of children. In the "Gospel of the Egyptians," quoted by Clement (Strom., lib. iii. p. 448), "When Salome asked the Lord, 'How long should Death prevail?' (not as being the evil of life, or of an evil creation), He answered,

'As long as you women bring forth children.' Then she said, 'Then I have done well in bringing forth no children, since there is no necessity for generation.' To which the Lord replied, 'Feed upon every herb, but that which is bitter eat not.' . . . . Salome asked when the things should be known, of which she inquired? The Lord answered, 'When you shall not need a covering for your nakedness; and when two shall become one, and the male with the female, when there shall be neither male nor female.'"

S. Epiphanius says, "speaking of those who receive this gospel of the Egyptians, "They make use of all the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, but principally of some certain passages, which they pick out according to their own corrupt and preposterous imagination."

Yet all the while there is a yearning and a longing for a higher and more spiritual mode of life, with which we cannot but sympathise; a retiring from the world, and a simplicity of existence, out of which, surely, true saintship could be formed, had they only been taught the right way. There is, and we do not wonder at it, an attractiveness irresistible, extending throughout the whole United States. Thousands of persons enter into union. Mount Lebanon is but one of eighteen Shaker societies, which are scattered through these United States. They go on increasing; in 1860, they were estimated at six thousand strong:—

"No one can look into the heart of American society without seeing that these Shaker unions have a power upon men beyond that of mere numbers. If a poll-tax were decreed, they might pay less into the exchequer than the Seculars, the Second Adventists, the Schwenkfelders, and the Jews; but their influence on the course of American thought is out of all comparison with that of such minor sects. The Shakers have a genius, a faith, an organisation, which are not only strange, but seductive; which have been tried in the fire of persecution, and which are hostile to society as it stands. A Shaker village is not only a new Church, but a new nation. These people who have just been out with me in the fields and lanes, know nothing of New York, or the United States. They are not Americans; they have no part in the politics and quarrels so often raging around them. They vote for no President; they hold no meetings; they want nothing from the White House."—Pp. 107, 108.

We shall have something to say presently on the subject of celibacy and a conventual life; we must first speak a few words on another religious phase, which is far more extended, and has a far more powerful hold on the American people than

any of these, though it does not form itself into a positive sect, we mean what is called spiritualism—we should be more disposed to call it demonolatry. In giving it this name, let us not be supposed that we are expressing any opinion as to the reality or unreality of the communication with spirits, or whether those spirits be the souls of the departed, or demons assuming their name, or whether the whole thing be not a mixture of imposture and excited imagination. Whatever it may be, it answers exactly to the magic, the incantations, the responses, which were rife in the heathen world, and which formed a considerable portion of the Gnosticism which infested the early Church.* As such it forms the *religion* of three millions of the inhabitants of the United States. We say *religion* advisedly, for we believe those who put their trust in "spiritualism," renounce all connection with the Church, or any Christian sect. They have their own notions of God, as well as of spirits; and these notions are as far from the Catholic Faith as anything can well be. Here is a specimen of their magic:—

"Not a few of the delegates pretended to the possession of miraculous powers; to the gift of tongues, to spiritual insight, to the art of healing. Nearly all the adepts undertake to cure diseases by imposition (scoffers say by a very great imposition) of hands. In the current copy of 'The Banner of Light,' you may count a score of male and female—mostly female—mediums, who publicly advertise to cure diseases of every kind—for due amount of dollars—by spirit agencies; a certain virtue being conveyed from the physician to her patient, by the movement of the hands, in imitation of the apostolic rite."—P. 161.

One is a "medical clairvoyant;" another is a "trance-test medium;" another is an "electric magnetic healing and developing medium;" another medium is "developed to cure diseases by drawing the diseases into himself." This last is a very ancient Gnostic idea, and is to be found still practised in the East and in Africa. The writer of this article has twice witnessed the process of performing this magical process in North Africa; and very strange were the results of this process on those who professed to take on themselves the diseases of others. It was accompanied by music, incantations, and

* Those who wish to trace out the likeness further between the ideas of modern spiritualists and the ancients on the subject of demonology and miracles, may consult the works by Dr. Hugh Farmer, where a vast amount of information is given. We by no means agree with Dr. F.; we think him entirely wrong on some main points; he was also ignorant of the doctrines of the Gnostics, and consequently misapprehended much of the New Testament language; but he has collected a mass of valuable information.

burning of incense, as well as frantic and almost superhuman bodily exercises. Besides taking the diseases of living persons, some of these mediums become possessed of the souls of the departed. Thus:—

"Ten days after his (John Pierpont's) funeral, Mrs. Corant, a Boston medium, who writes spirit messages for half the American public, announced that she had got his soul back again into her drawing-room; a presence visible to her, sensible to some, audible to many. Charles Crowell and J. M. Peebles report that, in their presence, Mrs. Corant fell into a spirit-trance, when the soul of John Pierpont passed into her (after the fashion of Ann Lee), and spoke to them through her lips of that higher world into which he had just been raised. 'It was evident,' say they, 'that *some* spirit was taking possession of her, for it pourtrayed its last earthly scene.'"—P. 153.

One of the sentences uttered by this spirit through the lips of Mrs. Corant was this:—

"Brothers and sisters, the problem is now solved with me, and because I live, you shall live also; for the same *divine Father and Mother* (*sic*), that confers immortality on one soul bestows the gift upon all."—P. 153.

The words which Mr. Dixon puts in italics—we suppose they are so in the magazine from which he quotes—have a meaning in the creed of these Demonolatrists; for we are told:—

"Like Elder Frederic they maintained the dual nature of the Godhead, assuming a female and a male essence—a Motherhood as well as a Fatherhood in the Creator,—and, like Sister Mary and Elderess Antoinette, they inferred from this duality of God the equal rights and privileges of the sex on earth."—P. 159.

This, again, is no new invention, for it is as old as Gnosticism, and was one of its doctrines.

Origen, in his homily on Ps. lxxxii., speaks of a sect called Elkesites, from one Elxai, a Jew; his words are: "Besides they produce a certain book, which they affirm to have fallen down from heaven; which they who observe and believe shall obtain the pardon of their sins; a pardon different from that which Jesus Christ bestowed." S. Epiphanius (Hæres. xix. § 4), says of this book: "It contains many fabulous things, such as the description of Christ, *viz.*, that He was a certain Power (*Δύναμις*: see Acts viii. 10;) *i.e.* an invisible body, whose dimensions he asserts were as follows, *viz.*, His height was twenty-four schenia, about 66 miles; His breadth 24

miles, and His thickness proportionably wonderful: so also His feet, &c." . . . . Then it is added, "The Holy Ghost is of the female kind, and, like Christ, of the stature of a man, reaching above the clouds, and standing between two mountains." We forbear to trace out other resemblances.

Of the utter unbelief and blasphemy with which these Demonolators have entered, the following is a sufficient proof. At a "great spiritualist convention:"—

"Miss Susie Johnson said, she for one would build no more churches, 'for they had already too long oppressed and benighted humanity.'"

"Mr. Andrew Foss 'thanked God this was not an age of worship, but of investigation.'"

"Dr. H. T. Child said that 'spiritualism has bridged over the gulf between Abraham's bosom and the rich man's hell. Let thanksgiving be added to thanksgiving for every blow that is struck to weaken the superstructure of human law—law which, by the hand of man, punishes man for doing wrong.'"

"Mr. Perry said, 'as a spiritualist, I have yet to learn that we hold anything as sacred, and I am opposed to any resolution that has the word sacred in it.'"

"Mr. Fenney said, 'the old religion is dying out. We are here to represent this new religion, born of the union, and of the types of humanity in a cosmopolitan geography, the die of which was cast in the forges of Divine Providence.'" [!!]—Pp. 163, 164.

We need not quote more to show the state of utter unbelief and apostacy that exists in America at this moment: wide-spread, positive not negative, rejection of the Catholic Faith. In fact we may point to America at this moment as presenting features singularly resembling those that existed in the Roman world, especially in the Eastern portion of it, when the Gospel was first preached. This fact is suggestive of the duty of the Church; it is to adapt herself to the existing state of things; the mere routine of matins, and evensong, and sermon, mere parochial visitation, can never meet the evil, can never supply that which a people in the state of mind here described is actually craving for. Even in this country, which is so full of old traditionary respect for orthodoxy, we find the parochial system alone wholly inadequate; we must supplement it with sisterhoods, brotherhoods, guilds, missions. Far more is this needed in America. Why cannot seme men of faith and energy strike out a course fitting for the necessities of the times? Land is easily procured, therefore but little capital is needed. Why cannot a conventual life be commenced,

and here the three great monastic virtues be practised—chastity, labour, prayer? We purposely omit poverty, for that seems almost impossible, but we might add simplicity of life. Surely there would flock to such a retreat thousands of as willing hearts as flock to the heretics of Mount Lebanon, or to the great Salt Lake Valley! From such might stream out Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of Charity, who would penetrate the dark alleys of vice and unbelief, and nurse and tend the sick and dying. Who can tell what an effect this would not have on the womanhood of America, to break down the false and wicked system under which they are living, and bring them back to the Christian idea of a wife and mother? Then too, what a school of the Prophets! young men trained in the Catholic Faith to go forth to missionise the poor, whom the Anglo-American Church so little cares for, and so fearfully neglects. Read the following, ye priests of the Church, and blush for shame, that ye have not yet followed such an example, and that ye have permitted the "teacher of lies" to usurp your place, and to do your work:—

"The spirit of the Mormon Church may best be read in the missionary labours of these saints. It is their boast that when they go out to convert the Gentiles, they carry with them no purse, no scrip; that they go forth, naked and alone, to do the Lord's work in the Lord's way; trusting in no arm of flesh, in no power of gold; taking no thought of what they shall eat, and where they shall lie down; but putting their lives and fortunes wholly into the hands of God.

"The way in which an elder may be called to such missionary work has, in this age of dollars, an air of primitive romance. Young (say) is walking down Main Street; he sees a young fellow driving a team, galloping a horse, riding in a cart; a thought comes into his prophetic mind; and, calling that young elder to his side, he tells him that the Lord has chosen him to go forth and preach, mentioning perhaps the period and the place; the time may be for one year, for three years, for ten years; the locality may be in Liverpool, in Damascus, in Delhi, in Pekin. Asking only a few hours' time to put his house in order, to take leave of his friends, to kiss his wives and children, that young elder, chosen from the street, will start on his errand of grace.

"I have talked with a dozen of such missionaries, young men who have been called from the ranch, from the saw-mill, from the peach-garden, at a moment's notice, to depart without purse or scrip, to go forth, naked and alone, into the ends of the earth. Elder Stenhouse had been sent to labour in France and Switzerland, Elder Riter in Austria, Elder Naisbit in Eng-

land, Elder Dewey in India and Ceylon. Their method was the same.

"Without money and without food, the missionary starts on his journey; hiring himself as a driver, a guard, a carpenter, to some train of merchandise going either towards the river or towards the sea, as the case may be. If his sphere is Europe, the young elder works as a labourer to New York, where he hires himself out either as a clerk, or as a mechanic, according to his gifts, until he can save his passage money; if this course is inconvenient to him, either as to his person or his mission, he agrees with some skipper to serve before the mast, on which he will take his place humbly with the poor sailors, to whom as the ship heaves onward, he finds many opportunities for preaching the glad tidings of a Mormon's rest in the Valley of the Mountains. He is not a man of books. 'We have no colleges here,' said Young, 'to train our young men to be fools; we just take a fellow from the hills, who has been felling wood, killing bears, and catching wild colts; we send him out on a mission, and he comes back to us a man.' Arrived in Europe, without a penny, without a home, the missionary finds, if he can, a lodging in the house of some local saint. If he cannot find such lodging, he sleeps on a bench, on a stone step, under a tree, among the litter of a dock. 'I landed in Southampton,' said Elder Stenhouse, when relating his many victories of the spirit, 'without a farthing in my purse, and I sold the boots from my feet to buy a plank from which I could preach.' Elder Dewey told me he had travelled from Salt Lake to San Francisco, from San Francisco to Ceylon, from Ceylon to Poonah, toiling, preaching, begging, never fearing for the flesh, but confiding everywhere and always in the protection of God; labouring among Californian miners, among Chinese sailors, among Cingalese farmers, among Bombay teamsters and muleteers, seldom wanting for a shelter, never wanting for a meal. Such is the spirit of the young Mormon elder. Sometimes he is helped forward by a saint, oftentimes by a stranger and a Gentile; at the worst, he gets employment as a tailor, as a carpenter, as a dock-yard labourer. Living on crusts of bread, sleeping beneath lowly roofs, he toils and preaches from town to town, ardent in the doing of his daily task; patient, abstinent, obscure; courting no notice, rousing no debates; living the poor man's life, offering himself everywhere as the poor man's friend. When his task is done, he will preach his way back from the scene of his labour to his pleasant home, to his thriving farm, to his busy mill, in the valley of the Great Salt Lake."—Vol. i. pp. 254 to 257.

S. Paul went forth, "taking nothing of the Gentiles," but working with his own hands, with Aquila and Priscilla, "for by their occupation they were tentmakers."

We stated that the Roman Catholics in the United States had not kept up in number equal to the emigration from Ireland. Since writing this we have met with a statement made in a San Francisco Journal, which seems to contradict our assertion: we therefore give the latest authorities we know of on this subject, and leave our readers to decide.

"Fortunately, we are left in no doubt as to the facts of the case, for the wide-spread apostacy of the Irish from their ancient faith, concurrently with their social elevation, is both admitted and lamented in the most passionate terms by the dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church. The whole Catholic population of the United States is about four millions, including Irish, French, Germans, Spaniards, and Italians, and is divided into 43 dioceses, with 3,795 churches, under the care of 45 bishops, and 2,317 clergymen. Their ranks are continually recruited by immigration from Europe and the natural increase of the population; but the continuous losses from apostacy, especially among the Irish, who form the largest Catholic element in the States, retard the progress of Catholicism. Passing over the evidence of Father Mullens, who reported, sixteen years ago, 'a falling away of two millions Irish Catholics;' and the admission of the Bishop of Toronto in 1862, who estimated the loss at between three and four millions; and the statement of Bishop England that there was a loss of 50,000 in his own diocese alone; we have a Roman Catholic Journal in Philadelphia, in January, 1864, disclosing the fact that the priesthood were aghast at their losses, and asking, 'Who fill the Irish churches of America? The new emigrants.' He adds that had the Irish who had come to Philadelphia for eighty years continued Roman Catholics, that city would then have had twenty-five more churches than it now has, and 100,000 more Catholics to fill them; and he concludes with the remark, 'well might the illustrious Archbishop Kenrick scornfully exclaim that the Church in America had lost more than it gained.' It is calculated that she has lost between four and five millions of the general Catholic immigration; but if we accept Mr. Maguire's preposterously high enumeration of Irish immigrants, and their immediate descendants—nine millions—the loss must be regarded as still more extensive. The fact is acknowledged on all sides that large numbers of young men, in the Eastern cities and rural districts, mostly the sons of Irishmen, are quitting the Church of their fathers, sometimes to embrace Protestantism, and still oftener, at least for a time, to fall into infidelity." *

* "*The Irish Abroad,*" *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1868.

Roman Catholic Progress in the United States.

(*From the "Monitor," San Francisco*).

The recent addition of twelve new dioceses to the organisation of the Church in the United States, draws our attention forcibly to the extraordinary growth of Catholicity among us. The American Catholic hierarchy now comprises no less than fifty-nine bishops and vicars apostolic (exclusive of coadjutors), and about three thousand three hundred priests, though even this number is wholly inadequate to the wants of the population. Yet it is scarce sixty years since a single diocese comprised the entire Union within its limits; it is not fully eighty since a Catholic bishop first set his foot upon her soil; and within that time the Church has expanded from a few congregations to its present dimensions. At the close of the War of Independence, the United States was a thoroughly Protestant country * * * * Through trials from without and trials from within, through the wild outbursts of fanaticism, the insidious snares of more crafty foes, and the defection of some of its own members, it has thriven and grown to its present dimensions. Wondrous as is the growth of the United States, it is far surpassed by the comparative increase of Catholicity; for while the one has increased tenfold in three quarters of a century, the other has grown at least a hundredfold in the same time. The most remarkable thing about this extraordinary increase is its regularity and uniformity over the greater part of the Union. The Church progresses in Nebraska and here in California as rapidly as in New York or Baltimore; and in spite of the enormous difference between the number of its children forty years ago and to-day, it still continues to increase at the same rate. For many years it was hardly believed by outsiders that Catholicity could maintain its existence in this country, and the increase of its professors was regarded as a mere temporary accident of the European emigration * * * * It is now, however, no longer possible for even the dullest to ignore the progress of American Catholicity. No Protestant denomination can pretend to rival it, and it is highly questionable whether the entire Church membership of all the other religious bodies surpasses the Catholics in numbers * * * * In almost every city of the Union, in S. Louis, Chicago, Baltimore, Washington, New Orleans, and here in San Francisco, they range from one-third to one-half of the entire population, and their numbers throughout the country can scarcely be less than seven or eight millions * * * * Since 1850, the number of churches has nearly tripled, and within the last seven years the clergy have increased almost 50 per cent., and the laity, apparently, in nearly the same proportion. The Church has now passed through many of the obstacles which formerly impeded her

course; proselytism is less active; the aggressive spirit of Protestantism is diminishing; old prejudices are dying out, and social barriers are no longer raised against Catholics * * * * Another generation will decide our religious destinies, and ere the termination of the present century, we will be a Catholic nation." *

* "*Church Opinion*," May 28, 1868.

ART. XXIV.—THE DECAY OF EVANGELICALISM.

1. *The Life of the Rev. William Marsh, D.D.* By his DAUGHTER. London: Nisbet.
2. *William Wilberforce: his friends and his times.* By J. C. COLQUHOUN. London: Longmans.
3. *The Sling and the Stone.* By the Rev. C. VOYSEY, B.A. London: Trubner.
4. *The Doctrine of the Eternity of Evil.* Sermons by the Rev. S. MINTON. London: Longmans.
5. The *Record* newspaper. London: 1868.
6. The *Rock* newspaper. London: 1868.

THE writer of a biography intentionally shows us the mind of the person whose life he writes, and also, but unintentionally, his own. It requires many qualifications to make a life really interesting, and among these an absorbing and intense reverence for the subject is one of doubtful value. It leads to the repetition of wearisome details, commonplace observations, facts which cannot be of the smallest interest beyond the family circle, and to a false estimate of the character through blindness to its defects. Miss Marsh's life of her venerable father will not add to her reputation as an authoress, nor will it, we think, advance in the judgment of devout and earnest Christians the peculiar school of theology to which she belongs. It is declining in all its best characteristics—with a rapidity painfully manifest to bystanders, and its publications demonstrate this by indications which no conventional language can obscure.

Dr. Marsh's life is one of those which only an affectionate daughter or too partial friend could have thought worth writing. As the preface observes, it "is no record of stirring events, nor is it connected, except by passing allusion, with any public matters. But it may serve to show what were the doctrines, opinions, and practice of the Evangelical School of the last century: and to prove what a blessing an English clergyman with his heart full of love to God and man may be in his quiet sphere."

We have many far more interesting lives which tell us this of the earlier school of Evangelicals, with the additional value derived from records of their inner history recorded by themselves, while our cordial sympathy can be better given to those whose whole energies were devoted to the destruction of evil,

and not as latterly, spent in ignorant though well-meant opposition to a higher faith and holiness than their own.

The state of English Society against which the earlier Evangelicals had to contend, and did so effectually contend, is thus described by Mr. Colquhoun :—

"In spite of Johnson's writings, the fashionable world ran its old course with little change. If it was bad in the days of Addison, so bad under Queen Anne and George I. as to make divines despond and good men augur the worst, it had not changed much for the better towards the end of Johnson's life ; . . . . . the habits of high life were bad habits, and the opinions of clever men were bad opinions. Men and women played high ; fortunes were squandered at Faro and Quinze. Sunday and Saturday were alike for the gamblers. Fox contracted huge debts, and taught the Prince of Wales to do the same. When Count Adhemar was struck down by apoplexy, a large party assembled, in spite of his illness, at his house in Grosvenor Square, on the Sunday evening; and the Faro bank in the drawing-room went on briskly, separated by a thin partition from the bed in which he lay dying. The Clubs were the resorts of politicians. At these it was the fashion for every one, from the prince to the parvenu, to play high. In Brookes's and White's, Almack's, and the Goose-tree clubs, estates were staked and lost; and there were other orgies even more scandalous which were talked of with a smile. Horace Walpole tells us with a broad grin of the ways and doings of Charles Fox. Lord Sandwich, Lord Temple, Selwyn, and Lord March, were all fashionable leaders; and the repute of statesmen was not affected by proceedings which now would make society turn its back on them. Lord Temple's vices did not prevent the first Pitt from demanding the Garter for him. . . . . Lord Sandwich published verses in which it was hard to say whether vice or blasphemy exceeded. . . . . Lord Thurlow, keeper of the royal conscience, and the king's favourite chancellor, and Warren Hastings, were alike notorious. . . . . In such a state of society religious observance was small. The sermons which Blackstone heard when he came as a young man to London, were, he has told us, below the standard of the morality of Plato or Cicero. He himself gave it as his opinion, that for all that they contained of religion, it would have been hard to say whether the preacher believed in the Koran, the Talmud, or the Bible. By the most decorous persons Sunday was treated as a day of pleasure. Ladies of the most correct life, like Mrs. Montagu, had their regular Sunday parties and Sunday concerts, to which Hannah More was invited. The Court had their Sunday drawing-room; the Speaker and the Cabinet on that day gave their public dinners. A change indeed had

reached society, and flushed over it some freshness. This began among the middle and lower classes, and touched at last the upper ten thousand. Peers and peeresses, wits and authors, had been tempted by curiosity to listen to the sermons of Whitfield; and in the drawing-rooms of Lady Huntingdon and Lady Fanny Shirley, the preacher had addressed fashionable congregations, which till then had never heard of Jesus Christ. . . . . Still there was a profound horror of Methodism; and if any one was known to read his Bible, or to converse with a religious clergyman, he was marked and laughed at. Methodism, in fact, was put down as low, vulgar opinion, only to be tolerated in the middle and lower classes. . . . . If a clergyman became Methodistical, preferment and promotion were closed. For what had the upper class to do with these things? They were useful only to tame the rabble. The Decalogue, Horace Walpole said, was only meant for these low fellows: the upper classes had a better rule of life, and had no need of chains and curbs."—(W. Wilberforce, p. 107.)

Such was the state of things against which the piety of Venn, Milner, Fletcher, Hervey, Newton and others, induced them to devote their lives, labours, prayers, and self-denials. They preached to those who had "never till then heard of Jesus Christ." They did not denounce the world and the gratification of the flesh for other people, and pursue it in a different but not less attractive form themselves. Nor did they turn with bitter spite against those who loved their Lord and Master with as deep a love as their own. Could they have believed that the time would come when men who claimed to hold their principles would turn from the contest with the world to attack those whose devotion to the Blessed Saviour is the one guiding-star and moving-spring of their lives, because it is perceived in mysteries beyond the grasp of their poor faith? If it had been revealed to Fletcher, and Martyn, and others of that time, that their representatives under the name of the Church Association would thereafter band together to persecute and drive from the Church men whose whole hearts are given to our Blessed Lord, and whose whole lives are one long act of prayer and worship, whose first and last thoughts in the day are affectionate longing for work for Him, and for rest in Him; who have found Him in the Daily Sacrifice over the loss of which Wesley so mourned, and who only do not admire the language in which such as Dr. Marsh speak of their Lord because it is too poor and commonplace, and because it is too weak to express their appreciation of His work and their personal adoring love; surely had it been known that such men as these would be the great aversion of

the later Evangelicals, their fathers in religion would have spurned them with heavier anathemas than have ever proceeded from those whom they so eagerly attempt to destroy. Imperceptibly to themselves, the Evangelicals have changed round from attacking the world to siding with the world against the Church, until they have become so blinded, that while condeming Dr. Colenso with words, they support him in action, sooner than find common ground with those to whom our Blessed Lord is all in all.

Devout and loving minds, like that of Dr. Marsh, do not seem to suffer much personally from their errors in faith. He, one of a race fast dying out, never allowed the bitterness of controversy to degrade his Christian character, so far as it is exhibited to us in his life. His object was the conversion of sinners, not the extinction of Ritualists, though even in him there are marks of the decay of his system, apart from the impress left through the medium of the writer's mind.

Why is it that the most devout persons of the present day, on coming in contact with very aged persons of the Evangelical school, regard them with affectionate admiration, though differing—or rather while being differed from—widely? Why is it that those of the same school in middle age, though manifesting a good deal that rouses expectation of a satisfactory Christian character, so frequently betray something grievously disappointing and inconsistent, while the younger generation excite no feelings but repulsion and pity, often reaching to disgust? These almost invariable experiences must have a cause, and a deep-seated one. It lies of course primarily, as all the unprejudiced can see, in the decline of piety, and the increase of animosity against other good men, and it may be well to investigate some of the defects that have led to it. Evangelicals so fully acknowledge the existence of a decline among themselves, that we may be spared much of the unpleasant task of pointing it out. They admit it and they mourn over it, but it never strikes them to compare and contrast their own devotional habits with those whose principles they profess to admire, and the men and objects against which the two generations have waged war. The earlier Evangelicals fought against lazy, unorthodox, and ungodly clergy, and the later against the hardest-working and most self-denying men in England. They contended with the scepticism of the day in the last century, but in these times Evangelicals either side with it or let it alone. "When we read the zealous rebuke of Mr. Voysey by the Bishop of Salisbury, as reported in our Convocation intelligence, and

find him urging on his episcopal brethren to condemn his books," says the *Clerical Journal*, "we naturally . . . feel the application to the Bishop of the words, 'How wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull the mote out of thine eye, and behold a beam is in thine own eye?'" There is scarcely a doctrine of Christianity, from the Incarnation and Atonement downwards, which Mr. Voysey has not blasphemed, and yet we are told that the doctrine of the Real Presence is on the whole more explicitly condemned by the Church of England than the denial of these. Mr. Voysey teaches that our Divine Master was born of the natural union of Mary and Joseph, and was not God at all. He asserts that there is no devil, for that God would be a devil to allow such a being to exist, with other blasphemies far exceeding anything Colenso ever asserted; and yet "on subjects like those so badly handled by Mr. Voysey, our Church has been less explicit in its definitions and safeguards than on those on which the Bishop of Salisbury has so rashly descanted." So speaks the Organ of the Church Association, adding another to the daily increasing indications that the Evangelicalism of to-day is allying itself with Rationalism. We have the earliest warning of this tendency in the sympathy expressed, even by men like Dr. Marsh, for Dr. Arnold, who must be regarded as the founder of the Rationalistic school.

"Deeply did my father regret that he had not earlier known him. They met but once; and differing upon some points as they did, it was but the lovelier to see how their hearts sprang to meet each other—drawn by the mutual sympathy of their noble natures and by the yet stronger attraction of love to the Saviour."

The real "attraction," it is easy to perceive, could not have lain here, or why did it never draw him towards those who, though also "differing on some points," love our Lord with a devotion and fervour far exceeding Arnold's cold generalities? The spiritual life must be sadly dim, when a man thinks it worth while to specify that "within the last few days he had felt quite a rush of love in his heart to God and Christ;" and the standard must be very low where such a remark is quoted as anything worthy of admiring comment. No. The real point of contact between Dr. Marsh and Dr. Arnold was in their mutual opposition to the Catholic movement. "They held alike that the belief in the necessity of a 'succession' lay at the root of the errors already corrupting a large body in the Church; involving as it does the invalidity of the Sacra-

ments as administered by the Presbyterian, Lutheran, and other Churches; and carrying with it the doctrine of a priestly and mediatorial power. My father felt the full value of the noble protests against the sacerdotal system borne by Arnold."

The real fact is, that the intense devotion to our Blessed Lord manifested by the advanced Catholic School is pitched as far beyond the understanding of the modern Evangelicals as the fervour of Wesley and Fletcher was beyond the dry moralists of the last century. Nothing, we think, can strike a Catholic more in reading such lives as Dr. Marsh's, than to see what are to us the most everyday thoughts and matter-of-course feelings, treasured and reproduced as such remarkable evidences of piety, and as such precious and valuable observations. We have letter after letter in this book filled with such remarks as these:—

"I have been much struck lately with the thought of the privileges to which we sinful creatures are called:—He hath called us to *peace*. He hath called us to *holiness*. He hath called us to *the fellowship of His Son*. He hath called us to His *kingdom and glory*. This is the calling according to His purpose of grace and mercy given us in Christ Jesus our Lord."

"The covenant is ordered in all things and sure. The love of God is everlasting. The work of Christ is perfect. The promises of Scripture are yea and amen. Here we must rest. The enjoyment of divine truth may be much interrupted, but truth itself is unchangeable, and confidence honours its great Author."

So we might quote from page after page; indeed all the correspondence is of this character. There is no fault to be found with it, but the wonder is that any one should think such truisms worth writing in a letter, and still more that any one should think them worth publishing. We feel as we do when we are called upon by little children to share their ecstatic admiration of a daisy or a buttercup. Of course it is lovely, as every work of God is lovely, but our garden and hot-house flowers are lovelier far. This they do not see and will not believe. "We part," as Dr. Pusey has said to them, "where you begin to deny." The rejection of Baptismal grace was, as we might expect, the stumbling-point to Dr. Marsh, as it has been to many others. The undue prominence given (at first not unnaturally) to the subjective side of the Gospel, led by degrees to obscuring, and latterly to denying, its objective aspect. To preach about a Saviour was the great work of the clergy, and to apply that knowledge by faith to

the individual soul was the great work of the Christian. Neither were aware that this is only the outset. Faith is only a means to an end, and not an end in itself. Belief in our Blessed Lord brings Him no nearer to the soul than before, but it gives the essential for making available the Sacraments He has appointed. Union with Him is not an act of the mind and heart, it is an actual transfer of one Nature to the other, through the medium of the Sacraments. Unbelief is a bar to their reception, and according to the degree of faith and love is the closeness of the union given by them.

With the earlier Evangelicals, denial of the objective grace of the Sacraments was negative; but as the doctrine expanded, from a clearer view of the Incarnation, it was either accepted as a logical sequence or categorically denied. With some, no doubt, this arose from a defect in their reasoning powers, but with others, worldliness and relaxed mortification unfitted them for a reception of higher truth. Degeneracy was both a cause and a consequence of their remaining behind. The more they opposed the truth they did not receive, the less they continued to adorn the truths they did hold, and the weaker became their grasp of them. The unsparing searching mental discipline prescribed by Fletcher and Cecil disappears among their later followers. There are no more instructions how the natural man is to be mortified in its most sensitive part, or how recurring sins are to be again and again cauterised. The spiritual state is only tested by its acceptance of Christ, and the course prescribed is the one most likely to blind the soul to its own defects. Preaching, which was at first held to be the great work of the Christian priest, has sunk to be regarded as the only one, and that divested as far as possible from its old self-denying adjuncts.

"Having preached thirty times in thirteen days," says Wesley, "I required a day or two of rest." And again:—"The number of communicants at Spitalfields made this Lord's Day a little more laborious than the former, but God added proportionally to my strength, so I felt no difference." Now, to preach twice or three times a week is considered full work, and it is far too fatiguing to administer the Blessed Sacrament individually to each communicant.

We are told of John Newton, that knocks at his door were loud and quick from morning to evening, and with every knock came an interruption. "When I hear a knock at my study door, I hear a message from God. It may be a

lesson of instruction, perhaps a lesson of patience; but since it is His message, it must be interesting."

"I make it a rule never to see any one before two o'clock," says in modern days the clergyman of a large town. "If I did not, how could I ever get through my *Times*?"

The flesh and the world have been the cause of Evangelical decline. The asceticism and stern self-denial of their earlier teachers have been neglected, and so the spirit became subjugated to the flesh, and the soul unable to grasp doctrines requiring a higher exercise of faith. Fasting, from being regarded as the natural adjunct of any day of solemn prayer, and as a means of purifying the soul and humbling it, has not only been neglected but condemned. Where now are Fletcher's nights of prayer, and days when one light meal was his only refreshment? We look for them now among Catholics alone, and for the blessings that accompany them.

Loving hearts, like that of Dr. Pusey, hoped that the presence of a common foe like Rationalism would have drawn all those who profess to love our Blessed Lord into united action, but those who so hoped had not allowed for the decline that has taken place in that love. Evangelicals would rather be found on the side of Dr. Colenso than on that of the Bishop of Cape-Town. Had their love been what it once was they would have rejected such a course with horror. The spring of love has been choked with the cares of this life and embittered with the poison of party animosity. Sacramental grace had been denied, and the supernatural authority in the Church which gives it power. There was then only State authority to fall back upon practically, and when weighed in the balance against the honour of our Lord, it dragged them down to the ground. Disguise it with a cloud of words as they may, yet there is the fact—that Evangelicalism has used all its influence to protect an unbeliever in his position as nominally a Bishop of Christ's flock, and its adhesion will find the consequences in a still greater loss of personal love and holiness. As we have just said, a Catholic's love for his Lord is as much beyond their comprehension as the happiness of religion is beyond that of an unbeliever. Such love for instance as that which leads women to resign gladly all that this world can offer of innocent joy, and in His dear embrace to find even in this life that it is gain, is totally beyond their powers of conception. Dr. Marsh speaks of Sisters as "prisoners without crime," and the conventual life as one of "rigidity and unhappiness." It is impossible to convince such persons that they might as sensibly pity two long-devoted

lovers on their wedding tour as lonely and isolated exiles. It is their misfortune that they cannot see, but their fault when they persist so stoutly that what they cannot see is not there.

"Both our Lord and the Apostle," says Mr. Cecil, "seem to establish it as a principle that a single state, when it can be chosen and is chosen for the sake of the Gospel, is the superior state."

Dr. Marsh married three times, and the last time at the age of seventy-three. His family, it is easy to perceive, absorbed the great majority of his time and thoughts, and his life altogether is much more suggestive of that of a layman than of a Christian priest. This must necessarily be so when a man does not recognise his own supernatural gifts and calling. The whole life, while remaining perfectly innocent and amiable, may yet be lowered. Yet he was suited to the time in which he lived, and has doubtless laid many a foundation on which others have built. His mistake was in thinking the foundation to be the whole structure, and that if he could see his people depart into another world conscious of their own sin and trusting in the Redeemer, his work for them had been accomplished. Through all his correspondence there are no practical directions for the conquest of sin, and no counsels but the merest generalities, as if the duties of a Christian soldier required only the presence of certain considerations and emotions, and not a life-long drilling and discipline.

It is curious to see how attachment to that modern popular system of Protestantism which has distorted the practice of the Church of England, is mistaken for attachment to the Church herself. The preaching of the Gospel, Dr. Marsh held, should always accompany the prayers of the Church, so that any true idea of Divine worship was not in his creed. It never perhaps struck him that the Church of England provides for public prayers fourteen times in the week, but only for one sermon, and that his judgment and hers therefore did not coincide. In accordance with this view, he changed the Festival services he found established at Beddington, for prayers and sermon once in every week. One cannot help thinking that if the rules of the Church were enforced about daily service, fasting, and other matters, those who have adapted her practice to their own standard would find that she could be no Church for Protestants. In days of neglect and laxity, almost any system may grow up unchecked in almost any communion, and it is only by rigidly enforcing the

prescribed standard that spurious growths can be detected and removed.

It is easier for those who see more of the truth than others to make allowances for those who see less, than it is when the positions are reversed, and therefore controversial bitterness on the Catholic side is far more inexcusable than on the Protestant. Of late, it must be admitted that the provocation has increased. We are quite contented to work with Evangelicals and to help them in their non-controversial labours as far as we can, knowing that faith and love will eventually set all right, but their active animosity is increasing, and is no doubt exceedingly irritating. When priests are spending all their strength and means in working hard for their flocks, it is a sore trial to be obliged to spend money in litigation, and to hear themselves reviled as if they were scarcely Christians at all, while open blasphemy is supported and protected. Yet, hard as it is to bear, it must be borne, and those who so attack us must be treated as though they had done us no injury. It will become easier for us as they take more and more of the tone and colour of the world. The attacks of holy men are far harder to bear than the assaults of the world, and give a peculiar and very acute pain. We feel that they ought to love us and appreciate our love to Him Whom we both adore, and we are disappointed as well as injured. But from the world and its allies we expect and wish nothing else, and as Evangelicals lose their Christ-like spirit and are actuated by worldly motives, their opposition loses its sting. But the unbecoming retort is too often forced from us, and it is a pity that it should be so. With Dr. Marsh and his fast-departing generation we feel so much sympathy that we regret him as an opponent for our own sakes, but for his successors we can only feel pity for their own. The tempers they show we should not like to see on our side, nor could we feel otherwise than ashamed of the amount of work they consider themselves called to do. Nor is the spirit of perpetually worrying and persecuting those whom you may nevertheless think in grievous error, one that it is advisable to see extended. The World has exercised its baneful influence, and deluded them into the belief which they are wont to consider one of the characteristics of Popery, that the putting down of heretics will suffice as a substitute for personal holiness. Let a man be a zealous supporter of the Church Institution and attack Ritualists, and he is certain to be regarded as a zealous and excellent Christian. If Evangelicals would but honestly consider how they would regard some of the acts of their champions

if they had only been on the other side, they might gain a truer estimate of the way in which we must necessarily regard them, and no longer place themselves under the command of such leaders. Once they would have done so, but all alike have felt the deteriorating influence, and wrong things do not seem to them wrong any more. Even in such a life as Dr. Marsh's, the corrupting influence of the World is perceptible. His disposition was too sweet and loving for attacks upon his brethren, and the exceedingly repulsive parade of titled acquaintance and relations which disfigures his biography is probably the biographer's fault alone. But the way in which the errors of those in high station are glossed over and even made a subject of thanksgiving, reveals unconsciously the force of these temptations even on an upright mind. In a younger generation this evil has become very apparent. Titles, fortunes, and aristocratic society, have become undisguised objects of pursuit. The work of the ministry is sought under favourable conditions for partaking of these advantages, and "good society" is a very frequent item in the requirements of an advertising curate of Evangelical principles. It is no uncommon thing now for clergymen to marry women with money, and then retire from their work. Some of them take to farming and a country gentleman's life, while others prefer the society of a watering-place, with or without a fashionable chapel or lectureship. And among others who continue in charge of their parishes, how many preach the same sermons over and over again! How many there are who seldom or never enter their schools, and who consider "social intercourse" the best way of fulfilling pastoral duties. The carriage and horses, greenhouse and croquet-ground, which would never have been tolerated by such men as Cecil and Martyn, are every-day appendages to the establishment of an Evangelical clergyman now. When he does not have them, it is because he cannot afford them. Where now must we look for the minister of God whose life is passed in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in fastings often, in hunger and thirst, in cold and nakedness? Is it not with those whose early mornings are passed at the Altar, and their days in ministering individually to the souls of their people? As it has been justly observed, it is no use for Evangelicals to contend that they do not believe in the Catholic way of working, and therefore are exempt, but they are bound to show that they make equal use of the machinery in which they do believe. They rely upon sermons, and they should preach every day as Fletcher did, at any hour from four in the morning till mid-

night, if that is the best hope for their people. Our priests are to be found at the Altar as early as four, gathering round them the working classes, and they are not unfrequently in the confessional till midnight, accommodating themselves to those who have no other time to spare. Services are provided for the people at their convenience, not at that of the parson. But where is there anything answering to this in the modern Evangelical effort? It is not that work to this extent is not in their system, for their earlier men were bright examples of activity; but it is that sloth and self-indulgence have, as might have been expected, encrusted a system which did not enforce self-denial as a simple act of obedience to authority, and which left out of sight the supernatural grace of ordination, given on purpose to sustain human nature in works beyond its power. They have disbelieved in the gift, and, as a necessary consequence, have ceased to stir it up within them. This disbelief in the grace of God and its objective bestowal lies at the root of much that is false in their system. It is curious to see its affinity with modern Ultramontanism. Dr. Manning considers our Anglican virtues to be only gifts of nature, and so the Evangelical considers all holiness previous to conversion. We are told of Dr. Marsh:—

"Even in his early childhood a sensitiveness, which lent an almost feminine grace to his maturer years, was balanced in its infantile measure by the same stedfastness and power of self-sacrifice which formed the groundwork of his character, when by the grace of God it was moulded into an example of real manliness, as consisting of all that is pure, and noble, and true, and strong, and tender, and lasting."

"*When*, by the grace of God." "Grace never had so little to do for any character as for my William's," said his mother in after years, in accordance with this unhappy theory that all marks of holiness previous to those deepened impressions which are regarded as a vital change, were not owing to the grace of God. They realise the fact that there must be some time when the soul changes its relative state towards God; and not seeing that the transition from the kingdom of wrath to the kingdom of grace takes place in holy Baptism, they are forced to fix its period for themselves at some point of life when the correspondence with grace was unusually apparent and sustained. To confound the commencement of life with the signs of its existence, and of its development, is as unscientific in theology as it is in physiology.

We often do not perceive the unsoundness of a building's walls, until some attempt to super-add an upper story reveals

the defects in the masonry. The personal zeal and holiness of its adherents will sustain many a defective system in the first generation or two; but it is sure, sooner or later, to break down. The Catholic movement has shown itself strong just where Evangelicalism has shown itself weak. It has not been the work of one or two saintly men, running their brilliant course and then giving way to a less devoted and then again to a still less devoted school. In learning and power, no doubt, the leaders of the Oxford movement stood pre-eminent, but the standards of devotion and hard practical work have steadily risen. The dryness and want of fervour which distinguished the early days of the movement have passed away. Marriage is regarded more and more as an inconsistency on the part of men professing high principles, and work in low neighbourhoods is much more sought after. As fervour has grown, so charity has grown also. Catholics do not hold off from Evangelicals and dissenters as they did once, when Jeremy Taylor and Wilson were the models of devotion rather than S. Bernard and S. Gertrude, and when sermons were in the style of Dr. Hook rather than in that of Father Ignatius. We have recognised the value of Evangelicalism as a partial expression of truth, more than as dogmatically erroneous, and we are content to work with them as far as we can. Daily prayers no longer satisfy us; we must have a closer and more loving intercourse with our Blessed Lord than prayer and meditation can give, and we feel that our confessions must be more frequent to fit us for such nearness to Him, and our warfare with sin more close and unsparing. We see just the reverse of all this in the Evangelical school. There is so little of the Gospel of Christ left among them that we feel the title to be as great a misnomer as they do that of "Jesuit." They use the language, it is true, that they learned from their instructors; but negative omissions have become positive denials, and their object now is to destroy what they ignorantly fancy to be error. Believers do not want to be told all their lives long of the necessity for a Saviour, and unbelievers have heard it so often that the words cease to have any meaning; but this, with the errors of Popery, and a few distinctively Protestant specialities, form the sum total of so-called Evangelical teaching, while even from this the fire and the power are gone. They teach these things because they passively believe them, and not because they have been light shining in darkness to themselves. One who has been a wicked man half his life is much better fitted for an Evangelical teacher, than one who has been brought up by pious parents on the

modern system. There are many reasons for this, but perhaps it is mainly because a system which is so completely subjective requires the stinging remembrance of past evil and loss to sustain the powers at their necessary pitch for effect upon others. The children of Evangelicals are, however, generally but poor imitators of their parents, and the degeneracy does not seem likely to become less.

More self-denial and more faith would have saved them. The one would have kept their spiritual perceptions in the acutely sensitive condition needed for the reception of truth, and the other would have helped them to see beyond the materialism which is their fancied stumbling-block, into the true nature of the Divine Order, whereby, with a God in human flesh for a centre, the outward and visible of this world is linked with the inward and spiritual of the world to come. All that true Evangelicals love, we love also; all that is most wonderful and striking to them, is only not so to us because it is our every-day food; all that sustains them in life and comforts them in death is to us but the alphabet of our heavenly science, blessed in its measure, but only the commencement of far more glorious truths. But while we see the evidences of known truth not acted up to, which are apparent at every public meeting, in the Report of the Ritual Commission, and in every sermon and parsonage, we cannot wonder at the absence of that gift of faith by which alone the transcendent glories of the Gospel can be perceived.

ART. XXV.—RECENT SERMONS.

1. *Sermons, Parochial and Occasional.* By the Rev. FREDERICK GEORGE LEE, D.C.L., Perpetual Curate of All Saints', Lambeth. London: J. T. Hayes, Lyall Place; and Bosworth, 215, Regent Street, 1868.
2. *Sermons on Unity.* By F. C. MASSINGBERD, M.A., Chancellor of Lincoln. London: Rivingtons, 1868.

THERE is, perhaps, no aspect of Church work in the Anglican Communion in which the contrast between past and present is more striking than that of the pulpit. Not even the recent transformation of some of our great Georgian churches in London—with their towering three-deckers and obtruding galleries—into buildings fit for that worship in which our forefathers delighted, with elevated altar, richly adorned sanctuary, and simply and unobtrusively furnished nave for the faithful; not even this creates so much astonishment and surprise as is felt on comparing the sermons of the "revived" pulpit with those which have preceded them, no matter whether their theological teaching has been high or low.

For it is not so much in their doctrinal contents that the contrast creates surprise; for *such* a difference might be reasonably expected. The contrast is more than one of matter merely, it is one of style and official character. There is a spirit and tone about them which the others have not, and which no efforts could ever give them. No one can gainsay the fervour of the sermons of the Evangelical school, nor the erudite and classical polish of those of the Anglican. But here we have something quite different. The sermons of the new school are deficient neither in fervour nor in scholarship; these qualities they possess in common with the others; but they also have certain characteristics which the others have not.

In the first place they speak "with authority;" there is an air about them which is quite unmistakeable in the witness which it bears to the wholly supernatural character of the office from whence they proceed. Not only are things said which no one would have dreamt of saying whose theology was that of "the Bible and the Bible only" standard, or that of the "absolute infallibility of the Book of Common Prayer and the perfection of the Anglican Episcopate," but they are said

in a way which no one whose belief, if one may so call it, was a mere matter of natural and intellectual conviction, whether Biblical or otherwise, ever has or ever will succeed in imitating. There is an *impersonality* about them; by that we mean an absence of all conscious suspicion that the message delivered is derived from a source of personal discovery, which at once distinguishes them from all preaching which has for its subject any truth or set of truths individually found by ordinary intellectual processes in Bible or Prayer Book. The preacher has become the unconscious agent of the "Living Voice;" he speaks as one having authority, yet without being oppressed by a direct sense of having it; and hence there is an air about his preaching which is completely *sui generis*, and which forms a most striking contrast to all other attempts of the kind.

A *second* distinguishing characteristic of the revived pulpit is its precision of language; there is here no vagueness, no superficiality, no platitude; the message proclaimed is that in which the supernatural teacher has—and in which the baptised hearer ought to have—as intuitive, as perspicuous, and as unhesitating a belief, as that which the natural teacher has in the commonest axioms of human science. And just as, if a person is master of a scientific fact at all, he will be able to explain it in simple yet definite terms which leave a sharp and decided impress on the mind of the hearer, instead of merely oiling the mental tablet all over with the soothing balsam of sonorous but unmeaning verbiage; so as the doctrine here taught is present in clear and complete outline to the preacher's mind, and has for him moreover the simple and compelling obligation of Truth, the language too announcing it is, therefore, equally simple and uncompromising. There is here no mere rhapsodising of religious *sentiment*, as so often appears in the Evangelical school; still less is there the facile eloquence of those whose creed is to have no creed at all, and who seem to adopt every conceivable theological expression of the Church for the sole purpose of using it in every conceivable sense except the right one. The language of the revived pulpit is like the message itself which it conveys; it is the simple measured language of *Faith*, not the fluency of self-formed *opinion*, nor the confused Babel-cries of religious liberalism and unbelief.

And this leads us to a third characteristic. For as moral Truth not merely compels a speculative assent, but conveys disciplinary obligation as well, so here too we find the same straightforward simplicity, the same unflinching importunity

of style. Practical applications of the message are made, which it would never have occurred to any one to make who had not an intuitive, though wholly unself-conscious belief in his authority as the supernatural instrument of the powers to bind and to loose; and they are made too in a manner of which there is no trace in the pulpit exhortations of other schools. When you add to all this the comprehensiveness and variety of matter at the command of one who is determined to preach the *whole* Truth, as well as those rich stores of practical *illustration* which are open to him who really believes in Christ's Holy Catholic Church and the Communion of Saints, we have an amount of difference, which cannot fail forcibly to present itself to any one who will set about comparing, even from a mere literary point of view, the preaching of the new school with that of any or of all English Post-Reformation schools which have preceded it.

The volume of sermons which stands first at the head of this article contains in a very powerful degree those distinguishing notes of which we have been speaking. By all readers of this periodical this volume will be received with unusual interest, as coming from one who has been, in God's hands, one of the chief instruments in carrying forward that work the progress of which it is the special province of the UNION REVIEW to watch and to chronicle. But in reality the volume requires no such extraneous recommendation, and even those who take but little interest in the formal efforts now being made for Corporate Re-union, and who regard the whole Catholic Revival with suspicion, will find in it much to admire in its vigour of thought and beauty of expression; whilst those readers of it who do sympathise with the high aims and hopes of the author will feel all the more thankful that he has at last obtained a permanent cure in which his powers as a preacher of the Gospel may find continuous exercise and employment, to the greater glory of God and the eternal welfare of English souls.

Without entering into any detailed criticism, which seems to us somewhat out of place in dealing with the official utterances of an accredited messenger of Jesus Christ, we will merely state that this volume may fairly be classed in the highest rank of recent publications of the kind, such as Mr. Liddon's *Oxford Sermons*, Mr. Carter's *Lenten Lectures*, or Mr. Orby Shipley's *Sermons on Sin*. In some respects it covers the ground of both of the two last-mentioned. There is the same dogmatic precision which distinguishes Mr. Shipley's volume, but, as in Mr. Carter's, there is a greater fertility of

illustration; whilst a richer glow of poetical feeling is thrown over the whole, than is found, perhaps, in either. The language in many places quite rises to the eloquence of Mr. Carter, though there is not that fullness of meditative power which renders his writings such valuable helps to Christian contemplation. On the other hand, there are occasional dashes of the free and less conventional style of rhetorical appeal, which are so effective when well and judiciously used, and which are almost wholly wanting in Mr. Carter's volume. And in general we may add that Dr. Lee's style differs from both Mr. Carter's and Mr. Liddon's in a more sparing use of long and oratorical sentences.

We take from the first sermon, "The Knowledge of God and of His Son," the following passage, as a good illustration of the clearness of thought and vigour of diction with which the volume abounds.

"This deposit of faith, this revealed knowledge of 'the only True God,' and of 'Jesus Christ Whom He hath sent' is both definite and certain. For if it possesses not each of these properties, then it follows that man cannot believe. For belief of necessity implies certainty, and if there be no certainty and definiteness in the object of man's faith, then is there no faith; then is he but standing upon the shifting sands of doubt and disbelief, and thus faith gives place to opinion.

"However, this principle, though neither shifting nor variable, as regards the Church of the living God, for His message is ever definite and clear, is nevertheless a principle which in these latter times is too frequently either ignorantly obscured or boldly denied. For the stern facts of the present remind us that the ages of faith are past and the days of doubt are come. The Divine authority of the One True Church is continually being overlooked or rejected, and so man is driven to depend for illumination and guidance upon his own intellectual capacities, or his own innate but alterable consciousness of what is true or false. For what meets our gaze at the present day, but endless and perpetual disputes, jarring sects ever dividing and subdividing, each with its own particular portion of the revealed truth of the Most High forced into undue prominence, exaggerated or compounded with error; each confident of God's favour, but all absolutely contradictory to His Church, and bitterly inimical either to other? Thus, too, the frank confession of Socrates is repeated again and again by many, 'Only one thing I know, and that is, that I know nothing.'

"And these miserable but undoubted facts compel men to frame some theory by which they may seem to relieve themselves of the grave responsibilities which thus lie at their very

doors. Nor have they been long in so doing. The ancient rule of faith—*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus traditum est*—being forgotten or despised, is cast away as useless lumber, or contemned as a bygone superstition. The belief of the undivided Church is ignored or repudiated. So that in their extremity men have resolutely determined to declare that there is no definite nor certain doctrine in revelation, and this perhaps is the only dogma which they care to maintain. They continually imply that divine truth has no sharp nor definite outline; and act and write as though each person who may chance to be interested in the subject must define it for himself.

"In answer to this it should ever be remembered that knowledge, unless it be definite, is no true knowledge at all. With uncertainty we may opine or conjecture, but we cannot know. The axioms of physical science, for example, are known to be both certain and clear; otherwise they could neither be apprehended nor argued from. A mathematical problem which is not definite and plain is valueless. So, too, in other cases. When history ceases to be certain it becomes fabulous. And the same holds good as regards ethical science; for if a law be not explicit and definite, it carries with it no moral obligation. If in its language one is not instructed with distinctness what to perform and what to avoid, what to do and what to leave undone, it is quite clear that it can possess no jurisdiction over the conscience. And if this be self-evident in reference to human knowledge, how much more so is it with regard to Divine. If, as we believe, Almighty God has been pleased to reveal to mankind a knowledge of Himself, then is that knowledge both certain and definite; not vague and indistinct, but clear, precise, and unchangeable. 'This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only True God, and Jesus Christ Whom Thou hast sent.'"

The whole sermon on the Theological Virtues is again a striking instance of Dr. Lee's dogmatic precision, and of the happy power he has of so combining the technical terminology of the schools with the simpler language of the market, as to make the great truths of our religion intelligible to a mixed congregation, without allowing their definite outline to be toned down and lost in the mist of English colloquialism.

The greater portion of the volume is occupied with ordinary Parochial Sermons, being a selection, more or less continuous, of such weekly or occasional instruction as the faithful pastor, who takes the appointed Gospel as his text, provides for his flock during the ecclesiastical year. Those parish priests who observe Catholic custom in this respect will find much suggestive matter for their own adaptation in this part of the volume:

whilst the Advent series on Repentance will also be found of great use to those engaged in mission work.

There are, however, some sermons in the book which will have a particular interest for the reader of the UNION REVIEW on account of their special bearing on the great question which is uppermost in their thoughts and aspirations. We say *special* bearing, for it is obvious that every sermon which is a simple announcement of any portion of that Gospel which God's messenger the Church reveals to us, has in a general sense a most important bearing on the Re-union movement, no matter what its immediate subject. The sermons, however, on the "Progress of the Church," "The Catholic Revival," "The Vain Oblation," and "Mary, the Mother of God," have, as their titles would indicate, a special reference to the Re-union movement.

When this article is in the hands of our readers, the Association for Promoting the Union of Christendom will have nearly completed the first year of its second decade. Founded on the Feast of the Nativity of the Mother of God in 1857, it has been gradually adding every year to its members, till at present there are about eleven thousand who have entered into its holy obligations and who recite daily the appointed Collect and Pater Noster, and who, if priests, offer the Holy Sacrifice periodically with the Society's intention. That intention, it should ever be remembered, is a very *simple*, though a comprehensive one, and must not be taken to mean more than it really does mean. The object of it is simply that of *prayer* for the uniting together in the bonds of *Visible* Union all those who have been baptised with water in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. It is, therefore, obvious that all may join the Society, who profess to believe at all in Visibility as a mark of the Church; and in Visible Unity as a proper object of the prayers of the baptised. Only those, therefore, are excluded from joining it, whose idea of Christ's Church is that of an invisible community of "the predestined," bound together simply and solely by a conscious belief in the presence of the Spirit in their own hearts. These, of course, rejecting all idea of visible government or ordinance as essential notes of Christ's Church, cannot with any due regard to the meaning of words be asked to join with us in prayers for the restoration of Visible Unity. But, with this exception, *all* are free to join; no man is pledged to anything beyond the mere desire, expressed in prayer through the merits of the One Victim for the consolidation of the baptised into One Visible Communion of the

Faithful. Nothing is said of the *way* or *means:* no subscription is demanded to this or that *theory* of Re-union: all that is left in God's hands. Of course each member of the A. P. U. C. *as an individual Christian*, responsible to God as an intelligent and baptized being, must have his own opinion as to the real nature of this visible Communion and the true means, under God, of bringing it about. But *as a Member of the A.P.U.C.* he has no such opinion: his duty as a member of the Society is *simply* that common duty in which all unite and without which this or that subsidiary scheme, be it the true one or not, can never be brought to its fulfilment, the duty, namely, of prayer offered through the merits of the mediating Victim. The power, therefore, of the agency now at work in Christendom to effect this end cannot be measured by the actual numerical strength of the Society itself, for it is obvious that for each person who *formally* belongs to it, there are many more who, without belonging to it, nevertheless really fulfil its intentions. Every Roman priest as he stands daily at the Altar recites the very Collect of the Society at the time he makes his Communion; and there is not, one would think, a single believer in Christ's Church as a Visible Kingdom, be he Roman, Greek, or Anglican, who, if his Christianity be anything more than a form, does not pray daily for the "good estate of the Catholic Church; that it may be so guided and governed by Thy good Spirit, that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit and in the bond of peace," still there is no denying that prayer, when it assumes a corporate aspect, and is the result of a definite pledge, is more real, more fervent, and therefore, through the merits of Christ, more efficacious, than when such mutual obligation does not exist, or, if existing, is of such an extensive and universal character, as to run the danger of being discharged perfunctorily, or even not at all. All honour therefore be to him who has been God's instrument in bringing this society into existence, and in organising it throughout its now eleven years of increase and development. For the Society represents the *highest* aspect of the whole Re-union movement; that in which we are most brought to realise its *supernatural* character, and that, too, in which the greatest number can unite without any misgiving, or any compromise to schemes of detail which they are not yet prepared to advocate. And when we look back on these eleven years, when we measure the progress of that Catholic Ritual, for instance, which only *then*, be it remembered, after the "Liddell and Westerton" judgment,

took its rise:—when we contrast the frequent daily Mass, and the full and majestic note to which our congregations sing the great Eucharistic Hymns of the Church, with the monthly Communion and casual inculcation of the Real Presence from the pulpit, which were considered the *ne plus ultra* at the time of the Denison case; and when we contrast, too, the Poole and Boyne Hill cases with such a notice as that appended below, and the practical compliance with it; * who can say that the prayers of the A. P. U. C. have not been carried by the angels of God into heaven and there been mingled with the intercessions of those to whom the once "Island of the Saints" is specialy dear,—above all with those of her on whose birthday we annually commemorate the founding of the Association.

The Sermons before us are, however, a proof that the thanks of the members of the A.P.U.C. are due to Dr. Lee, not only for his direct work in the Association as its organising Secretary, but also for his boldness in vindicating and maintaining in his own pulpit those truths which the heart of the English people must be brought to recognise before any hopes of Re-union can be entertained. The Sermon on "Mary the Mother of God" has been published, we see, separately, and will, we hope, have a large circulation. The attack which is now everywhere being made upon the Church of Christ is of course a direct assault upon the Divinity of our Blessed Lord Himself, and the truth and office of His Incarnation. But it seems to be an axiom almost of theological science that where truth is opposed, the way to meet it is not by counter-assertion of that same truth itself, but by inculcating some other collateral truth logically necessary to it. Thus, as Dr. Lee has well pointed out in the Sermon in question, the earlier heresies in connection with the Incarnation were met (1) *theoretically* by definitions of the office of Mary and of her position and prerogatives in the economy of grace, and (2) *practically* by an increase of devotion to her Blessed Person. And in this procedure there is a sequence and connection of theological thought and fact which would seem to face us at the very outset of Revelation. For as the woman *first* fell, then the man; so

* Saint Alban the Martyr, Holborn.

A Priest will attend in the Sacristy to hear Confessions at the following times:—

Wednesday, 10 a.m. to 12. 2.30 p.m. to 7.45 p.m., and after Evening Service.

Friday, 2 to 6. p.m.

Saturday and Eves of Festivals, 10 a.m. to 12.30. 2.30 to 7.45 p.m. and after Evening Service.

also the woman must first rise, and then the man, not only *objectively*, in the order of fact, but *subjectively* in the minds and hearts of the faithful. Had not the first Eve disobeyed, the human race had never stood in need of a Redeemer; had not the second Eve obeyed, it could never—so far as God's purposes have been revealed to us—have obtained one. To speak of Mary as our co-Redemptress is therefore no mere devotional figure of speech; it is as strictly and literally true that we owe our redemption to Mary, as it is that we owe it to Jesus, only it is true *in a different sense*. Mary is the cause of our redemption in the same sense as Eve was the cause of our Fall; that is, she was the original and necessary, though not the immediate cause of it. For had Eve alone disobeyed and not Adam with her, the effects of that disobedience would have been confined, as it would appear, to her, and not have extended to the human race: she would have been the sole dark spot in a world of glory. And just so, had Mary alone been born without Jesus, and had shown to the world that perfect example of humility, purity, and absolute conformity to the will of God which she has shown, she would have been the one bright spot in a world of woe, "our tainted nature's solitary boast," but could not have saved the race. Nevertheless, she was *necessary* to our redemption in the order of fact; and so too she continues to be necessary to our acceptance of it in the order of ideas. For all Church history has shown that (1) theoretically a full and unflinching belief in *her* office and prerogatives, is absolutely necessary to a clear perception of those of her Divine Son, and that (2) practically those only advance in devotional fervour to our Blessed Lord, who seek a union with His Sacred Heart *through the Sacred Heart of Mary*:—

> "For oh! how can I love thy Son,
> Sweet Mother, if I love not thee?"

Rightly, therefore, does the Church in the Antiphon call the blessed Virgin the "destroyer of heresies." The threatened enmity was ever to be "between the woman and the serpent." And that is why the attacks of the Father of Lies on Jesus Christ have ever been met by pointing to the Eve whose obedience defeated him; and it is by live coals of devotion, snatched from the altar of the Mother of Mercy, that the "love waxed cold by reason of iniquity" has ever been kindled into new life. "Ave!" "Salve!" "Memorare!" are the watchwords of both Church and individual, when the waters of sin and unbelief are rising around.

To those, then, who have realised this truth and recognised

its application at various stages of Church History, it will be no matter of surprise that just at this present crisis of the never-ending war between the Church and the World, a new star should have arisen in the firmament of the Queen of Heaven, one whose rays were long ago perceived by doctors and saints in intermittent flashes, but which has now for the first time been brought into ceaseless view and made visible to the eye of each baptised member of Christ, to be his beacon-light in the tempest now fast gathering around him. Dr. Lee nowhere alludes in his sermon to the Immaculate Conception, *totidem verbis*, doubtless from a desire to avoid that which has been in England so almost universally misunderstood, and the proper and full explanation of which could hardly be given in the course of a single sermon. His expressions, however, are nowhere inconsistent with a full belief in this (for these days) "most wholesome and necessary doctrine." We say most wholesome and necessary; for a right understanding of it, involving as it does a full and clear recognition of nearly every separate detail of the Faith in connection with the Fall and Regeneration of mankind, is, to say nothing else, a most efficacious antidote and remedy for all that fast and loose theology, that hazy and promiscuous habit of thought and speech so common in our day, and which argues complete ignorance of those primary facts which lie at the root of the whole system of revealed truth. And if those too, who, though teaching a Gospel of Christ of their own making, are still sincere in their love to His Person, and are determined amid all the doubts and difficulties of our day to cling to Him, only knew how wonderfully His unapproachable dignity, His incomparable attributes are set off, so to speak, in heightened contrast against those of His Blessed Mother by the fact of her Immaculate Conception, and her need, notwithstanding this fact, of a Saviour, they would at once see in it "the anchor sure and stedfast," with which the Divine Teacher has furnished the Church in this, as many think, her last terrible struggle with the powers of evil. "The shield of Faith" is indeed to be the weapon with which we are to quench the fiery darts of the adversary, but as the darts are those of the nineteenth century, so must the shield be. If we therefore wish our shield to be impervious, let us hasten to add this new fold to its thickness, and in all our acts of faith let us not forget to include our belief in the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God.

If Dr. Lee's Sermons have a *positive* value in their bearing on the Re-union question, those of Chancellor Massingberd

have an equal value of a *negative* kind. If the former point out the *way* to Unity, by setting forth Catholic Truth, the latter point out more forcibly the *need* of it, by dwelling upon the growing dangers of the age and the spread of the Anti-christian spirit all over the world. Mr. Massingberd has not yet arrived at Dr. Lee's *stage* of thought on these subjects. The road however is the same. The longing for Unity is genuine and sincere; and expressed, too, not only earnestly, but clearly and intelligibly. There is the same hope, the same expectant waiting, though not yet gladdened by those visions of dawn, which, however faint, are still really visible to those who have mounted higher on the same path. "Union with the Greek Church, not with Rome," is the Chancellor's *ne plus ultra* at present. May his Sermons have had the effect of leading his hearers even thus far, for they will most assuredly not stop *there* long! The volume, in addition to Four Sermons on Unity (three preached at Lincoln and one at Oxford) contains two interesting Lectures, one on Religious Societies and another akin to it on Wesley, to a possible reception of whose followers in the Church allusion is made in one of the Sermons. The volume will naturally find its way into the hands of many who would be too frightened to read a Sermon by the Editor of the *Directorium*. May it too in its measure do the holy and peaceful work intended by it!

G. F. C.

FRAGMENTA VARIA.

No. VI.—Mr. MacColl's Exposure of the Anglo-Continental Society.

We copy the following important letter from the *Guardian* of August 5, 1868:—

Sir,—I read, some years ago, an essay by Mr. Meyrick on the "Theory of Equivocation," and his letter to this week's *Guardian* is a sufficient proof that he has mastered that theory in all its bearings.

I said that the Anglo-Continental Society was bringing discredit on the English Church by connecting itself with men of bad character in Italy. Mr. Meyrick replied that I "probably alluded" to a certain person who was in the pay of the Anglo-Continental Society; and that with respect to him the charge of immorality, which had been made against him, was "baseless." And then, in order to discredit my testimony, Mr. Meyrick quoted an impudent libel upon "six or eight English Priests," with an oblique hint that I was one of them. Mr. Meyrick made this quotation from "a Neapolitan journal;" but he did not think it necessary to tell your readers that the journal in question was *in his own pay*, and had for its editor the very man whose character was in dispute.

I met Mr. Meyrick's letter with a plain statement of facts, and this he characterises as "totally untrue," and declares that I am "misinformed on every point regarding which I profess to give information to your readers." Let us see.

I said that the editor of the *Emancipatore Cattolico* and President of the *Società Emancipatrice* was "a renegade Dominican Priest;" and as a proof of that assertion I mentioned that he had practically abjured not only his monastic vows, but even his character, by assuming the garb and address of a layman. Mr. Meyrick replies that "Signor Prota is not a renegade," but "an Italian Churchman," "striving to reform his Church from within, on the basis of Holy Scripture, the Catholic Creeds, the Catholic Councils, and Catholic antiquity." Let Mr. Meyrick show me from any of these sources a sentence or syllable which indicates that "Catholic antiquity" regarded a Priest who broke his monastic vows and abjured his clerical character in any other light than as a renegade, and I will admit his right to monopolise the virtue of "a calm judgment." Till then I shall continue to consider "Signor Prota" a renegade. But I am glad that Mr. Meyrick has avowed so plainly the character

of the reformation which he is seeking to bring about in Italy. It is well that the supporters of the Anglo-Continental Society should be aware that they are doing their best to reform the Italian Priesthood by simply abolishing it.

So much for my first "totally untrue" statement.

I made one mistake in my last letter, which, however, rather strengthens than weakens my charge against the Anglo-Continental Society, as I shall presently show. I represented the grant which has been withdrawn from Prota as made by the Anglo-Continental Society. On reflection, however, I began to doubt the correctness of this, and I lost no time in obtaining from Naples the true account of the matter. I found that my misgivings were well-founded; and you, Mr. Editor, will bear me witness that I sent you a correction of my mistake four days before Mr. Meyrick's letter appeared; though, as you were pressed for space, you were obliged to postpone its insertion till this week. Of this mistake Mr. Meyrick has greedily availed himself, and by dexterously breaking it up into parts, has manufactured several mistakes out of one.

And now I will show Mr. Meyrick that his correction of my mistake makes his case even worse than I represented it.

The representative in Naples of a society of English Churchmen, including several dignitaries of the English Church—the Dean of Chester, *I think*, among them—found it necessary, for the fair fame of the Church of England, to cut off all connection with Prota. He sent an account of the whole matter home to the Society in England, which, having examined into the facts, deliberately endorsed his decision. Mr. Meyrick then came forward, threw the ægis of the Anglo-Continental Society over the character of Prota, set at defiance the remonstrance of all the Churchmen at Naples, who were living on the spot and had an intimate acquaintance with all the circumstances, and still persists in subsidising Prota and his crew, and belauding them in the Reports of the Anglo-Continental Society. In other words, Mr. Meyrick went out of his way to commit, as far as he could, the Church of England to the doings of a man whose only recommendation is that he is a clever and unscrupulous controversialist. The letter which you have just published from the British Chaplain at Naples shows how much credit is due to the infamous fabrications of Signor Prota. It also gives your readers an opportunity of judging who is more open to the taunt of acting in a "hasty way," and "asserting as facts things that he cannot know"—Mr. Meyrick or I. I am sorry to see that Mr. Meyrick, in spite of all he knows, does not scruple to tout for subscribers to Prota's paper.

Mr. Meyrick says "the British Chaplain at Naples is not and never has been 'a friend of the Anglo-Continental Society.'" The British Chaplain and I do not agree on all

points, and among the points on which we differ might probably be included the best mode of helping on a reformation in Italy. But he is an earnest Churchman, anxious to promote a reformation in Italy, jealous for the honour of the Church of England, and intimately acquainted with the ways and doings of the so-called reforming Priests at Naples. He wishes well to the cause which the Anglo-Continental Society *professes* to aid; but he loves the Church of England too well to have anything to do with a Society which is making the Church of England a proverb of derision among thoughtful Italians.

Mr. Meyrick's laboured witticism on a misprint in my letter is sufficiently answered by the note which you were so good as to append to the letter.

"Prota," says Mr. Meyrick, "is not, and never has been, personally 'in the pay of the Anglo-Continental Society.'"

Mr. Meyrick must excuse me for saying that he is taking refuge in a quibble. The money is given to Prota as a subsidy to the *Emancipatore Cattolico*. But Prota is the editor and proprietor of the *Emancipatore Cattolico*, and therefore the money is given to him; and, in matter of fact, he disposes of it as he pleases.

I have a good deal more to say on this subject, but I shall reserve it for another letter. Meanwhile let me beg Mr. Meyrick to keep to the points at issue between us. They are these:—

1. English Churchmen at Naples, including the British Chaplain, after a careful investigation of facts, stopped a grant which they had made to the staff of the *Emancipatore Cattolico*; and *one* of the reasons of their so acting was the discovery that Prota had misappropriated part of the grant to his own personal use. Prota admitted this misappropriation in a letter *which I saw*.

2. Prota was employed by the Government to distribute some funds, and he lost that appointment.

3. Prota and his editorial staff had free quarters, by the favour of the Syndicate of Naples, in the Convent S. Domenico Maggiore. Here Prota was for some time in the habit of giving devotional tea-parties to the friends of Reformation in Italy. The company were attended to by a female in a Garibaldian jacket. Some of the visitors expressed their surprise at the apparition of a resident female among a band of reforming monks. But Prota assured them that the Garibaldina was the wife of the convent porter, and a most excellent woman. Some time after this, however, a street *fracas* took place, of which this most excellent woman was the heroine, and she had to appear before the police-court, when it turned out that she was not, and never had been, the wife of the convent porter.

4. The Syndicate of Naples was at last constrained, for the credit of the muncipality, to expel Prota and the whole staff of *Emancipatore Cattolico* from their free quarters in S. Domenico Maggiore. Your readers will appreciate the significance of this strong measure when I tell them that the *Emancipatore Cattolico* was an eager supporter of the Government, and that its editor is a very clever writer.

5. Mr. Meyrick knew all these facts, as he admits, "two years" ago. And yet he did not hesitate, at the last meeting of the Anglo-Continental Society, to put up Lord Harrowby to denounce, in language not usually current among gentlemen, all who ventured to expose any of the underhand doings of the society. I read Lord Harrowby's speech at Naples with extreme amazement, and it convinced me that the Reports of the Anglo-Continental Society are utterly untrustworthy. I spent more than three months at Naples last winter, and I declare, as the result of my own knowledge, that the last published Report of Mr. Meyrick's agent in that city is a ludicrous romance and that is the opinion of all Church-people at Naples.

In short, I went abroad predisposed in favour of the Anglo-Continental Society, and I returned to England with the conviction that the good (if any) which it does is infinitesimal; the mischief certain and incalculable.

And now I call on Mr. Meyrick to produce evidence on the strength of which he affirms that the scandals in connection with Prota "are an invention of the enemy to discredit an able writer and reformer." Who is "the enemy?"

M. MacColl.

July 30, 1868.

No. VII.—The Œcumenical Council.

[The publication of the Pontifical Bull convoking an Œcumenical Council of the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the 8th of Dec., 1869—the festival of the Immaculate Conception—took place on the 30th of June, in the atrium of the Vatican Basilica. The College of Apostolic Prothonotaries, accompanied by a Pontifical Chamberlain and the Apostolic messengers, were present at the ceremony. One of the Prothonotaries ascended a pulpit erected near the great gate of the Basilica, his colleagues sitting within, and, after a fanfare of trumpets, read aloud the Pontifical Bull of Convocation, two copies of which were afterwards affixed by the messengers to the columns of the principal entrance. The text of the Pontifical Bull is as follows:]

"*Pius, Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, for Future Memory.*

"The Only-begotten Son of the Eternal Father, out of the great love which He bore us, descended from His celestial throne in order to redeem, in the fulness of time, the whole human race from the yoke of sin, and from bondage to Satan and the darkness of error, into which, by the fault of their first parents, they had long since miserably fallen. And He, not declining from the paternal glory, was born of the Immaculate and Most Holy Virgin Mary, and manifested His doctrine and the rule of life brought from heaven, attesting it with so many excellent works, and giving Himself up as an Offering for us and as a Victim to God in the odour of sanctity. And having vanquished death, He, before ascending into heaven to sit upon the right hand of the Father, sent His Apostles into the world to preach the Gospel to every creature, and gave to them the power of ruling the Church purchased by His Own Blood, and thus constituted what is the column and firmament of truth; and, enriched by celestial treasures, shows the certain path of salvation, and the light of true doctrine to all people. In order, then, that the government of the Church should ever be maintained in a right and well-ordered course, and that the whole Christian world should uphold one sole faith, doctrine, charity, and communion, He promised His aid unto the end of time, and chose Peter, whom He declared to be Prince of the Apostles, His Vicar on earth, and head foundation and centre of the Church; so that, invested with this rank and honour, and with amplitude of chief and full authority, power, and jurisdiction, he should feed the sheep and the lambs, confirm the brethren, rule the Universal Church, and be the gatekeeper of heaven, and arbiter to bind and to loose; the effect of his judgments remaining unaltered in heaven.

"And that the unity and integrity of the Church and her government might remain perpetually immutable, therefore the Roman Pontiffs, successors of St. Peter, sitting in this same Roman chair of Peter, inherit and possess, in full vigour, the very same supreme authority, jurisdiction, and primacy of Peter over the whole Church.

"Hence the Roman Pontiffs, using their pastoral care and authority over the whole flock of the Lord divinely intrusted to them by Christ Himself in the person of the blessed Peter, have spared no fatigue in making every possible provision in order that from the rising to the setting sun all people and all nations should have knowledge of the evangelical doctrine, and, by walking in the way of truth and justice, attain eternal life.

"It is known to all with what unwearing care the Roman Pontiffs have sought to preserve the deposit of the faith, the

discipline of the Clergy and their holy and learned teachings, and the sanctity and dignity of matrimony, and to promote and extend the education of the youth of both sexes, to foster the religion and piety of the people and virtuous manners, to defend justice, and to assure the tranquillity, order, prosperity, and rights of civil society. Nor have the Pontiffs omitted, when they have deemed it useful, especially in times of great perturbation and calamity for our most holy religion and civil society, to convoke General Councils, to the end that, by consulting with all the Bishops of the Catholic world whom the Holy Ghost has appointed to rule the Lord's Church, they might by their united strength providentially and wisely ordain all those things that would chiefly serve to define the dogmas of the faith, dispel error already propagated, or that might thenceforward be propagated, illustrate and elucidate doctrine, uphold and reform ecclesiastical discipline, and correct the corrupt manners of peoples.

"It is already known and manifest to all how horrible a tempest now agitates the Church, and what grievous ills afflict civil society. The Catholic Church, her salutary doctrine, her venerated power, and the supreme authority of this Apostolic See are opposed and set at nought by the bitter enemies of God and man. All sacred things are contemned, ecclesiastical property is plundered, Bishops and honoured men attached to the Divine ministry and men distinguished for their Catholic sentiments are troubled in every way, and religious families suppressed. Impious books of every kind, pestilent journals, and multitudinous and most pernicious sects are spread abroad on all sides. The education of the unhappy young is nearly everywhere withdrawn from the Clergy, and, what is worse, is in many places confided to masters of impiety and error. Thus, to our poignant grief, and that of all good men, and with mischief to souls that can never be sufficiently deplored, impiety and corruption of manners have everywhere propagated themselves, and there prevails an unbridled license and a contagion of depraved opinions of all kinds and of all vices and immoralities, and so great a violation of Divine and human laws, that not only our most holy religion, but human society also, is thereby miserably disturbed and afflicted. In the heavy accumulation of calamities whereby our heart is thus oppressed, the supreme pastoral charge confided to us requires that we should ever increasingly exert our strength to repair the ruin of the Church, to heal the souls of the Lord's flock, and to repel the assaults and fatal attempts of those who strive to uproot from their foundation, if that were possible, both the Church and civil society. And truly, by the help of God, from the commencement of our Pontificate, we, conscious of our solemn obligation, have never ceased to raise our voice in our

consistorial allocutions and Apostolic letters, and to defend constantly by every effort the cause of God and His holy Church confided unto us by the Lord Christ, to uphold the rights of this Apostolic See, and of justice and truth, and to unmask the insidious devices of its enemies, to condemn errors and false doctrines, to proscribe impious acts, and to watch over and provide for the salvation of all the Lord's flock. And, following the practice of our illustrious predecessors, we have deemed it opportune to assemble a General Council, which we have already long desired, of all our venerable brethren, the Bishops of the whole Catholic world, who are now called to take part in our solicitude. These, our venerable brethren, prompted by the warmest love for the Catholic Church, and remarkable for eminent piety and for reverence towards us and this Apostolic See, anxious also for the salvation of souls, and excellent in wisdom, in doctrine and erudition, and greatly lamenting with us the grievous condition of sacred and profane things, they will hold nothing more precious than to communicate to us their judgment, and confer with us in order to provide salutary remedies for so many calamities.

"All these things have to be most carefully examined and regulated in this Œcumenical Council, more particularly with regard to all that in these evil times concerns the greater glory of God, the integrity of the faith, the respect for Divine worship, and the eternal salvation of men, the discipline of the Orders of the Clergy and their solid and salutary training, the observance of ecclesiastical laws, the amelioration of manners, the education of Christian youth, and the peace and concord of all. And, further, the Council must seek, by anxious study, that, by the help of God, all ills may be removed from civil society; that erring wanderers may be led back into the right way of truth, and that vice and error may be eliminated, our august religion and her salutary doctrine may everywhere be quickened by fresh life, and may still further extend their influence, and thus piety, honesty, probity, justice, charity, and all the Christian virtues may gather strength and flourish, to the great benefit of human society. None can ever deny that the strength of the Catholic Church and her doctrine does not alone regard the eternal salvation of men, but is essential also to the temporal welfare of peoples, and to their real prosperity, order and tranquillity, and even to the progress and solidity of human science—as the annals of sacred and profane history clearly prove by a series of splendid facts, and still constantly demonstrate. And since Christ the Lord so greatly consoles and comforts us with those words, 'For where two or three are gathered together in My name there I am in the midst of them.'—S. Matthew xviii. 20.

"We cannot doubt that in the abundance of His Divine

mercy He would vouchsafe to be present at this Council, in which we shall be able to establish those things that in any way regard the welfare of His Holy Church. Therefore, after most fervent prayer offered up day and night in the humility of our heart to God the Father of light, we have judged it to be expedient that this Council should be assembled. For this cause, strong in the authority of God, the Father Almighty, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, which authority we represent on earth, we, with the counsel and consent of our venerable brethren the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, by these present letters announce, convoke, and ordain the sacred Œcumenical and General Council to be holden in this our City of Rome in the coming year, 1869, in the Vatican Basilica, commencing upon the 8th day of December, sacred to the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, and to be prosecuted and conducted to its termination by the help of God, to His glory, and to the salvation of all Christian peoples.

"We therefore desire and command that our venerable brethren, the Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, as also our beloved sons the Abbots, and all others who by right or privilege are entitled to sit in General Councils, and to manifest their opinions to the same, should from all parts repair to this Œcumenical Council convoked by us; and to this effect we invite, exhort, and admonish them, both in virtue of the oath that they have taken to us and this Holy See, and of holy obedience and under the penalties by law or custom decreed against those who fail to appear at the Councils. We rigorously ordain and prescribe that they shall be bound to attend this sacred Council unless withheld by some just impediment, which, however, must in all cases be proved to the Synod by the intermediary of legitimate proxies. We cherish the hope that God, in whose hand are the hearts of men, showing Himself favourable to our desire, may grant that by His ineffable mercy and grace all the supreme princes and governors, more especially Catholics of all nations, growing daily more conscious of the immense benefits which human society derives from the Catholic Church, and knowing that the Church is the most stable foundation of empires and kingdoms, not only will not impede our venerable brethren the Bishops, and others, from attending this Council, but will rather aid and favour this object, and co-operate zealously as becomes Catholic princes in all that may result to the greater glory of God and the benefit of this Council.

"To the end that these Our Letters and the things therein contained may come to the knowledge of all whom it may concern, and that no person may be able to plead ignorance of the same, and as, possibly, they might not securely reach all those

to whom they may be personally addressed, We desire and command that the present letters be read publicly and audibly by the messengers of Our Curia or some public notary in the Lateran, Vatican, and Liberian Basilicas. After having been read, they shall be affixed to the doors of the said Churches, the gates of the Apostolic Chancery, in the usual place in the Campo di Fiori, and in other public places, where they will remain for some time for the information of all. When the originals shall be removed they will be replaced by copies in the same places. In view of such lecture, publication, and exhibition, we ordain that two months from the date of publication and posting of Our Letters, all and each of those whom they may concern will be bound thereby equally as if they had been read and communicated to them personally. We further order and decree that copies of these letters, written or signed by a public notary, and bearing the seal of some ecclesiastical dignitary, may be accepted as perfectly authentic.

"No man will be at liberty to oppose or rashly contravene this Our indiction, announcement, convocation, statute, decree, command, precept, and invitation; and if any shall presume to attempt this, let him know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of His blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.

"Given at Rome, at S. Peter's, in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord 1868, on the 29th of June, in the 23rd year of Our Pontificate.

"Pius, Bishop of the Catholic Church, L. ✠ S."

(Here follow the signatures of the Cardinals.)

ORIGINAL POETRY.

A MODERN PILGRIMAGE.

I.

Oh hapless is his lot who lives
Our modern life with little men,
The golden age comes not again,
And life nor peace nor pleasure gives.

For hushed are all sweet sounds by those
That jar upon the tortured ear,
We suffer from a constant fear,
An utter absence of repose.

Oh happy when the world was young
Were men who lived a peaceful life,
They knew not of our modern strife,
Or how to prostitute the tongue.

They lived among their flocks and herds,
With simple wants and homely ways,
And fruitful was their length of days,
And grave their thoughts, and wise their words.

Now words of wisdom seldom flow
From human lips, the fevered brain
Is restless, but a nameless pain
Forbids to fructify and grow.

The world a garden was of old,
Nor weed nor brier grew therein,
Nor death had access there, nor sin,
But God's good gifts were manifold.

The world still wore its baby-smile,
Nor yet oblivious of the hand
That fashioned it, adorned, and planned
A thousand wonders to beguile.

The wonders dimly understood
By Adam when he walked with God,
What time the new-born earth He trod,
Pronouncing all things very good.

Where may we now His foot-prints trace?
We nothing see save pain and sin,
Distress without us and within,
And God-forsaken seems our race.

For blind our eyes, our souls are blind,
If God there be, we know Him not,
And all uncomforted our lot,
We seek, but scarcely hope to find.

II.

Too well we know our own distress,
And how uncomforted our lot,
If God there be, we know Him not,
We share not in His blessedness.

For man his garden-home hath lost,
And when the day is cool, no more
He walks with God as erst before
This shipwrecked world was tempest-tossed.

And yet there have been some we know
Not all unblest who trod this earth,
And now and then the Angels' mirth
Hath found an echo here below.

Unless the Bible-writers lie,
Bright angel-feet have passed, 'twould seem,
Twixt earth and heaven; Jacob's dream
Revealed no unreality.

And once a voice of thunder broke
The silence, when to Sinai's crown
Moses went up, and God came down,
And all the mountain echoes woke.

"Those ancient fables but endure,"
I hear you say in quiet scorn,
"To grace, embellish, and adorn
An old outlandish literature.

"For men were children once, and then
They suffered from credulity,
But modern thought is bold and free;
Faith is for children, not for men."

And yet sin-burdened, wounded, crushed,
I find small comfort in your word,
And earth methinks can ill afford
To have her sweetest music hushed.

Not all, not quite, untrue perchance
Those ancient fables, here and there
God may have heard a good man's prayer,
And showed a gracious countenance.

And one day haply we may find
Not all forsaken is our race;
Though still averted be His Face,
It is not otherwise than kind.

III.

If God be kind, if God be good,
It would not then enhance our weal,
Unless He made His children feel
How real, how true His Fatherhood.

Old prayers, old psalms we oft have read,
Which seem (and dare we call them blind?)
The words of those who thought mankind
Still God-beloved, and governèd.

We read of men who knew Him well,
Had dealings with Him manifold,
And how they worshipped Him we're told,
Nor found Him inaccessible.

"Ho, every one that thirsteth, try
This stream, for you its water flows,
On you a Father's hand bestows
The dainties wealth could never buy."

So spake a prophet once, a sound
Most grateful to a famished world,
And Heaven's banner was unfurled
For helpless men to rally round.

"The Lord my Shepherd is, and I
Need fear no want," so sang the King
Whose youth was spent in shepherding
His father's flocks so heedfully.

You say faith is not to be prized
In men, yet, whether false or true,
Methinks no evil can accrue
From words so sweetly harmonised.

From words whose music finds a way
To hearts enfeebled by despair,
Methinks strong words of praise and prayer
Can do no harm, whate'er you say.

We gather comfort, courage, strength,
From all that breathes a hope so sure,
A trust so dauntless, such secure
Repose in arms divine. At length

We hear a prophet voice foretell
(But this 'twere folly to believe),
"Behold, a Virgin shall conceive,
And call her babe Emmanuel."

IV.

"Behold, a Virgin shall conceive,
And bear a son, and call his name
Emmanuel, and on the same
The ransomed nations shall believe."

So runs the strange announcement, yet,
Although the reason may rebel,
I hear a whispered voice "'Twere well,
Before that message you forget,

"The claims to sift and scrutinize
Of Him they call the Virgin-born:
If so uncomforted, forlorn,
'Twere worse than folly to despise,

"'Twere worse than madness to reject,
Whatever offers you redress;
His voice perchance is raised to bless,
His arm is lifted to protect."

It may be so; I feel if this
Be false, 'tis vain to search for truth,
Uncheered is age, unblest is youth,
Death hath no hope, and life no bliss.

I can no other creed embrace,
No other creed of love displays
Such wealth; oh how I long to gaze
In rapture on a human face!

A face that is divine as well,
A face I could not doubt or fear,
And such a face confronts me here,
Of such the Gospel-stories tell.

They tell of one whose hand could heal;
They tell of one whose love-lit eyes
Were full of tender sympathies;
Of one whose princely heart could feel,

Could bleed for all howe'er distressed;
Of one whose all-commanding voice
Could bid despairing men rejoice,
And mock them not when thus addressed.

My darkness, Lord, illuminate;
If light there be, Thou art the light,
Assist my spiritual sight,
Oh pity my forlorn estate.

V.

To Thee the darkness and the light
Are both alike, I well may wait
Till Thou my darkness dissipate,
And clear my spiritual sight.

Enough to know that Thou hast trod
This earth, and recreated all;
I hear Thy voice, I heed Thy call,
I know Thee now, my Lord, my God.

I hear about my path, my bed,
The words our Lady heard, "All hail,"
I call to mind the wondrous tale
Of Mary Angel-visited.

I call to mind the Virgin-birth,
The manger-cradle, and the Rood;
O Virgin-born, from Thee all good
Proceeds in heaven and in earth.

For unto us a Child is born,
To us a Son is given, Who
The world beneath Him shall subdue,
He is the Day-star, His the dawn.

The dawn which to my night succeeds,
When rises in my heart the star
That heralds day, and from afar
The storm-vexed spirit homeward leads.

The home which in Thine arms I find,
There, only there, my Lord, my King,
To sheep long lost and wandering
Thou art a Shepherd good and kind.

Dear Saviour, I have wandered long
Amid distractions and alarms,
I felt not Thine encircling arms,
I did not know that they were strong.

Strong to deliver, strong to raise
The fallen, to emancipate
The captives; Jesu, all too late
With rapture on Thy Face I gaze.

The Face whose Smile hath beautified,
Whose Lips have blessed a world undone,
Of ransomed Christendom the sun,
Thy Church's solace and her pride.

VI.

Dear Lover of the souls of men,
Still let me feel Thy guiding hand,
And things I scarcely understand
Become intelligible then.

Thou wast made man to recreate,
Ennoble, ransom, beautify,
And sharing Thy humanity,
By mysteries immaculate,

Thy healing sacramental touch,
Conveyed, imparted, we possess
Capacity for holiness
Within the Church Thou lovest much.

The Church! Thy Life Incarnate still
Extended and prolonged, Thy Spouse,
Ta'en from Thy side what time Thy brows
Were thorn-enclosed on yonder hill.

As Eve from Adam, so the Blood
And Water from Thy side became
The Church's life, and through her frame
Still flows a Sacramental flood.

Her foes how many! there are those
Who worship self and mammon, worse
Than heathen; others boldly curse
Their Maker, they are open foes.

But subtler ones there are whose voice
Proclaims aloud one half her creed,
The other half they dare to plead
Accords not with their wilful choice.

And so her seamless robe is rent,
And marred her beauty, and her crown
Is taken from her. Lord, look down,
On Thee her bleeding brows are bent.

Dear is my Mother Church, whose womb
Hath borne me, at whose tender breast
I gather strength; oh, may I rest
Beneath her blessing in the tomb!

Which is the gate of Holy Land,
And Thou to Whom the souls of men
Are precious wilt be with me then,
And I shall surely understand.

A. G.

LITERARY NOTICES.

Some friend of the Bishop of Argyle has been kind enough to send us a packet of the theological productions of that amiable prelate—for which we are grateful. Of five out of six, unfortunately, we are unable to make either head, tail, beginning, middle, or end. The following paragraph, however, on pecuniary details is neither wanting in clearness nor point. Our disestablished sister in the north—let High Church Radicals note—seems to be dying of starvation, if Bishop Ewing be not romancing financially, as he so frequently does theologically:—

"The last point," writes the Bishop, "which required consideration, was the condition of the finance of the Episcopal Church in the north. He regretted that it should be so prominent a question, but necessity made it so. In memory of the poverty of the Apostolic ministry, and the martyrdom of many Christian teachers, to complain of poverty seemed to be out of the province of the ordained servants of Christ. But as a practical question, affecting the continuance and utility of their ministry, it could not be avoided; and as a test of the state of mind of the Episcopal congregations, the poverty of the ministry was alarming. The poverty of the Bishops and clergy of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, in connection with the wealth of their people, and the exertions of other Christian bodies, was astonishing. In fact, on the revenues of the Church the Bishops and clergy could not exist—they must possess private fortune; but this ought not to be. Looking at the increased price of every commodity, unless a great alteration was made in the provision for their maintenance, the ministry of the Episcopal Church in this country must come to an end. He believed that the laity, as a whole, were not aware of this fact, or that some latent distrust of, or dislike, or misapprehension as to the Church, existed. Could these (if they existed) be removed, and could any organisation be devised which would amend the present state of things, a very great object would be accomplished, much anxiety be removed from many worthy breasts, and the future of this Church, and the great and glorious truths she enshrined, be less dark and doubtful than they were at present. As for themselves (as to suffering), they did not shrink

from it. Some sort of trial the Church is ever to have—that of poverty was not one of the worst; it was theirs, but its sting, perhaps, was, that it need not exist. The sting was that the wound was got in the house of friends. This ought not to be."

In days like the present, when anarchy and rebellion are sedulously fostered on every side, the histories of families who have well served both Church and State are read with great interest. We are indebted to Messrs. Longmans for a copy of a book recently issued, *Memoirs of the Earls of Granard*, (London: Longmans), being a history of the Irish branch of the noble family of Forbes. Well printed and got up, it will interest the antiquarian, or those in any way connected with the Forbes family. To us, however, it is of peculiar interest, as some of the Forbeses have played no unimportant part in the struggles between the Church and Puritanism—between the Powers ordained by God and Revolution—in the 17th century. The Forbeses generally embraced the Reformed religion in Scotland, and while some were led away by Presbyterianism or Protestantism, there were others who still adhered to the Catholic Faith. Bishop Patrick Forbes of Corse, was for many years Bishop of Aberdeen, and is buried in the old Cathedral Church of St. Machar, in that once Catholic city. His brother, Sir Arthur Forbes of Corse, founded the family of Granard in Ireland. The second Earl of Granard, although not a Roman Catholic, was stedfastly opposed to Dutch William, and was twice sent to the Tower by that Protestant monarch. Re-unionists must always watch with attention any return on the part of noble families to the Catholic religion. Although many of the Forbes family in Scotland are still Presbyterians, yet, on the other hand, many have returned and are returning to the ancient faith. The Episcopal Church in Scotland has recently lost her great benefactor, the late Lord Forbes; but the present Baron, well known at Oxford, will doubtless do all he can to aid the Church and remove those anomalies by which she is at present beset, and which cause good Catholics in England to view her with suspicion. The Forbeses of Craigivar and of Corse, too, have abandoned Presbyterianism for the One Faith. More recently we hear that the present Earl of Granard has become a Roman Catholic. Disliking, as we do, individual secession, yet we cannot but see in these and other things tokens of the presence of God with us: and, while all are equal within the Church's gate, yet it is a good sign when those whom God has placed in high positions are seen working for His kingdom on earth, and to the best of their ability helping to remove our miserable divisions. Aided by the prayers of those who have gone before, and the example of those who are still here, Catholics of all ranks must work,

slowly it may be, yet surely, for the re-union of the three great parts of the One Christian Family. Romans and Anglicans can at least pray for the day when present difficulties may cease, and the Church be visibly one, as of old, gathered into "One Fold," and under "One Shepherd."

From this point of view these memoirs may be regarded with interest, and the noble Editor will, we are sure, forgive us if we express a hope that he, in common with others at present separated from us, will do something towards breaking down the wall of partition dividing the English Church from the great Latin Communion.

Mr. Knott, of Greville Street, Holborn, has published *The Words of the Graduals, Offertories, and Communions*, taken from ancient sources, as now used at St. Alban's, Holborn. The book is eminently practical, and if the suggestions contained in it, for the use of proper and appropriate anthems, be carefully followed, great improvements as regards the good taste and accuracy of our services will take place. Its compiler has based the composition of it on a sound and rational principle, easily comprehended and as easily applied. For this he deserves great thanks.

The compiler of the *Manual of Pastoral Visitation*, (London: Parker), has based it on "The Priest's Prayer Book," but has not thought it necessary to acknowledge his obligations in this particular, which in our jndgment he certainly ought to have done. His book is of some value, and will be acceptable to men of moderation and timidity, who may find in it a manual of practical use in visiting the sick and afflicted. It is on the whole sound and well arranged, but does not give that prominence to Catholic doctrines and practices which we naturally look for at this advanced stage of the revival in the English Church. It is dedicated to the Archbishop of Dublin, who formally expresses his approval of its contents.

A Roman Catholic *Manual for Serving Boys and Low Mass*, (London: Burns), is clear, lucid, practical, and reverent throughout. It is founded on authoritative expositions of Roman ceremonial, and does great credit to its compiler, Mr. Brundrit of Birkenhead.

A fifth edition of the first part of *The Daily Sacrifice*, (London: Masters), has just been issued. It needs no recommendation at our hands, being a most valuable manual, carefully compiled and explicitly setting forth pure Gospel truths, without any admixture either of Zuinglianism or Calvinism.

Dean Hook's long Sermon at the consecration of the new Bishop of Hereford, entitled, *The Dis-establishment of the Theocracy*, (London: Parker & Co.,) lacks the old vigour and definiteness

of the earlier Tractarians, though it contains a thoughtful argument with regard to Church and State, which many will hold to be unsound. The Dean we are glad to learn has become a convert to the principles underlying the *Directorium Anglicanum*, for he writes as follows, p. 84:—"By the neglect of Ritualism the working classes were driven from the Anglo-Catholic Church; and it is by attention to Ritualism [that] we must bring them back." A wise remark, full of the soundest common sense.

"*Who's Who; or the Three Brothers,*" (London: Bosworth), is the title of one of those religious stories which are becoming so numerous. It is written with the evident intention of illustrating the evil influence of Protestant principles in the Church of England, and is full of somewhat tedious controversial conversations. As regards the robbery of the Church in the matter of rates, &c., the writer seems to have little sympathy with the sentimental, visionary notions unhappily so prevalent among professed members of the Catholic school. We, therefore, with pleasure commend it to our readers.

Evening Rest; or Closing Thoughts for every Day in the Year, (London: Mozleys), with a preface by Mr. Carter, consists of a text and a few verses harmonizing together, and is compiled with judgment and good taste.

Louise Mallac, a sketch from the Sacred Heart (Oxford: Mowbray), is a brief memoir of a French nun, which cannot fail to be read with interest and edification. We recommend our readers, especially those amongst them who have themselves embraced the religious life, to obtain and peruse it.

New Ground, by the author of "The Heir of Redclyffe," (London: Mozleys), is a story for young people which displays the writer's usual charm of style—her life-like descriptions, easy conversation, and clever delineation of character. A clergyman with his family go out to the South African Mission, and this is a history of their work and adventures, the chief interest being centred in two sisters of very opposite character, whose conduct respectively, under difficulty and hardship, illustrates the principle that deeds are better than words.

We have received *A Letter to my Flock* (London: Burns), from the Rev. George Akers, a recent convert to Rome. By ourselves it will, for obvious reasons, remain uncriticised, as its author at one time co-operated by his pen in these pages in promoting the movement for Corporate Re-union; and we consequently hesitate to write anything harsh or uncharitable regarding this production of so amiable and devoted a 'vert. Mr. Akers, we note, writes, "Some people think it very strange of me to keep up our old acquaintance, and to go among you, now

that I am no longer your pastor." If the "going" is for proselytizing purposes—as no doubt it is—we are amongst this "some." Furthermore, a man who for seven or eight-and-twenty years of his life has been holding and teaching that white is white, should be modest and retiring before he starts up in agonising haste to maintain with threats of everlasting darkness for those who cannot quite go with him, that white is black.

The Bishop of Honolulu has wisely compiled an attractive volume entitled *Five Years' Church Work in the Kingdom of Hawaii*, (London: Rivingtons), in order to give those who are interested in the more recent missionary operations of the Church of England an accurate idea of what has been already effected in the Sandwich Islands, and what is to be attempted in the future. Written with great simplicity of style and remarkable clearness, it is a book eminently calculated to lead those who read it to take a warm interest in this part of the Christian family. Independently of the Church portion of the subject, some valuable information is wisely provided in the chapter entitled "Sketch of the Islands and people, commerce, social condition, etc.," which will be interesting on other grounds; while the illustrations give an admirable idea of what is being done. The new Cathedral, the nuns of Miss Sellon's order, the Schools for various grades of young people, the Hospitals for the sick, are all referred to and described: so that we have a book of considerable value, sterling interest, and some importance, deservedly worthy of being procured and preserved by our readers.

The Bishop of Worcester's *Charge*, 1868, (London: Rivingtons), might be mischievous if it were not so utterly weak and wishy-washy. Dr. Philpott, evidently no theologian, desires it to be known that he is a Zuinglian as regards the Holy Eucharist, an opponent of Corporate Re-union, and a somewhat indefinite admirer of "our glorious Reformers." On all these subjects we hope he may live to change his mind and alter his policy. As regards the Ritual question his remarks are as superficial and trumpery as it is possible for them to be. We suppose the clergy are bound to listen periodically to this kind of vapid commonplace. The Bishop, however, was *not* bound to print it, for it certainly is an unworthy, if not a contemptible production.

Most earnestly do we hope that every reader of this Review will at once order Dr. Littledale's Liverpool Lecture on *Innovations*, (London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.) Pointed, trenchant, frequent in his use of strong adjectives, with great powers of illustration and wit; at times a little coarse, perhaps; its author has produced a vigorous and remarkable essay which will do great good. The "Notes," not the least valuable part, com-

pletely bear out the statements of the text, and will enable those who wish to study the character of the "Reformers" for themselves, to do so with effect and success. The Lecture, published for sixpence, is a most valuable contribution to the Literature of the Catholic Revival.

Mr. Benson, of Cowley, has written a judicious Preface to a small tractate translated from the French, entitled *The Religious Life Portrayed, for the use of the Sisters of Mercy*, (London: Hayes.) Systematic, deeply devout, clear and lucid, it is written with great power, considerable practical knowledge, and sound judgment. Now that the religious life has become so widely adopted in the Church of England, we may look for a large circulation for this treatise, which will be likewise acceptable to some who are leading a devout and regular life in the world.

One of the best of Dr. Goulburn's books, and he has written plenty, perhaps too many for his own credit's sake—is entitled *Popular Objections to the Book of Common Prayer considered*, (London: Rivingtons.) The Lectionary, the Commination Service, and the Athanasian Creed, are considered in four well-reasoned Sermons *ad populum*. We dislike the constant use of the personal pronoun in pulpit discourses, displaying as it does an apparent egotism, out of place when men teach with authority. The Dean's style too is a little too familiar and somewhat wanting in dignity. Otherwise these Sermons, especially the last two, are admirable and likely to be very useful.

Father Paul Bottalla, of the Jesuit College in North Wales, gives us nothing new in fact regarding *The Pope and the Church considered in their mutual relations*, (London: Burns.) His attacks, in good English and temperate language, upon the Greek, Gallican, and Anglican theories are vigorous, but second-hand and rather wearisome: his quotations from the Fathers, when looked at by their context, in very few cases imply what he intends them to cover: in some very important cases they obviously do not. Nevertheless, he has bolstered up several foregone but novel conclusions with some ability and great care—considering that History nowhere countenances a recognition of the preposterous claims now made for the Pope by the most rash of Ultramontane fanatics.

Mr. S. C. Malan, who evidently thinks himself a light of unusual brilliance, has translated from the Armenian an interesting *Life of St. Gregory the Illuminator*, (London: Rivingtons.) To this has been added a very readable and original account of the Armenian Church, written with some knowledge of the subject and with remarkably scholar-like power, by the translator, who has made great use of reliable original documents, and is well up in his subject. This volume deserves a place on the library-shelves of every literary clergyman. Its Preface, how-

ever, is disfigured by a childish and ridiculous fling at the Ritualists, of whose principles and practices Mr. S. C. Malan, with all his pedantically-exhibited scholarship, is as completely ignorant as an aboriginal New Zealander.

Dr. Lee has published a Letter to Mr. Gathorne Hardy, *The Church of England and Political Parties*, (London: Bosworth), which treats of the attitude which, in his judgment, ought to be taken up by the clergy against both the political and religious Liberals. It sketches with clearness the present state of politico-ecclesiastical affairs, uttering a warning and pointing a moral. The question of Corporate Re-union is considered in its political aspect, and as few people have had greater experience in presenting this subject for acceptance than Dr. Lee, what he has written demands consideration. The pamphlet, though sketchy perhaps, is full of subject-matter for thought, and should be read with care and attention.

We have received from the Messrs. Clark, of Edinburgh, two more volumes of their valuable Ante-Nicene Library, Tertullian's *Treatise against Marcion*, and the first volume of *St. Cyprian's Works*. We can but repeat our general approbation, more than once placed on record here, of this useful series; remarking, at the same time, that the first-named of these volumes (which we have carefully examined), is translated and edited with great care, judgment, and success. The reasonable price at which the books are issued, moreover, should place them within reach of thousands—more especially as they are so well printed and got up.

Amid much that is dark and dispiriting, we rejoice to find that the facts stated in the *Third Report of the Eastern Church Association* are so full of hope and consolation as regards Corporate Re-union. Bigots there are undoubtedly amongst Easterns as well as amongst Westerns, who are as impracticable and insane as they are selfish and narrow-minded; but bigots seldom do any great and grand work, and they happily die off, impotent and snarling, giving place to the Catholic and charitable. The officers of the E. C. A.—we are happy to learn that the Hon. C. L. Wood is now the secretary—would do well in pressing the question of Anglican orders upon the attention of Eastern theologians: for Western theologians are wholly ignorant, and apparently intend to remain so, of the Anglican side of the question.

The first portion of Archdeacon Bickersteth's *Charge*, 1868 (London: Rivington), is mainly practical in its point and bearings: the second is occupied in touching briefly and superficially, but yet with good judgment and some ability, on the evils with which England is threatened by scepticism and revolution. This latter portion, eminently thoughtful, deserves a careful

consideration. We are glad to note a really liberal and tolerant policy advocated for the much-abused Ritualists.

Mr. Mowbray's monthly publication, *The Gospeller*, is certainly and deservedly a success. It may be ordered of him at his shop in Cornmarket Street, Oxford.

The Proceedings at the Laying of the First Stone of Keble College, Oxford (London: Rivingtons), is a most attractive and acceptable volume. It contains the actual proceedings at laying the foundation-stone, well-reported; the Bishop of Oxford's stirring sermon at St. Mary's; an account of the meeting in the Sheldonian Theatre, and a list of donors of 20*l.* and upwards. To this is added a ground-plan of the proposed college, and a perspective view from the north-east. The book, in small quarto, is very handsomely got up.

Mr. G. R. Prynne's *Hints on the Management of the Sunday School* (London: Hayes), ripe with Christian wisdom and practical experience, deserves a wide circulation amongst those who are called upon to co-operate with the clergy in promoting the efficiency of such schools.

Experiences of Forty Years (London: Masters), by an hereditary High Churchman, is thoughtfully written by a keen observer of passing events. Its main value consists in the contrast which its perusal enables us to draw between our national Church forty years ago and its present altered position, in regard both to East and West.

Mr. Arthur Brinckman's *Notes on Islam* (Church Press Company) is a valuable manual for missionaries, carefully compiled and well arranged. An introduction however, setting forth something concise of the history and philosophy of Mahometanism, seems to be needed to give an otherwise valuable book that completeness which is lacking in its present shape.

The Messrs. Parker have published Jeremy Taylor's *Golden Grove* for one shilling. It would be well if this devout volume sometimes took the place of translations from the Italian and Spanish, with which the enthusiastic are just now threatening to flood us.

Mrs. Hope's Life of that heroic and admirable predecessor of Archbishop Longley, *S. Thomas à Becket*, (London: Burns), though written purely and simply from an Anglo-Roman point of view, is a book of considerable interest and of some literary merit. The authoress has discovered nothing new regarding the saint, but has worked up with skill and judgment the old materials already provided by Mr. Froude, Dr. Giles, Mr. Morris, Canon Robertson, and Dean Stanley, colouring all with an uniform Roman tint. The book is written in a scholarly style and attractive manner, and deserves a wide circulation. For S.

Thomas and Laud, both Archbishops of Canterbury, we have ever had the sincerest veneration. Had the latter been a Roman Catholic he would have been long ago canonized. As our authorities, however, have not assumed power to canonize, we must wait for that event until Corporate Re-union is sealed.

The style of Mr. C. G. Floyd's visitation sermon, *Christ's Mystical Body*, (London: Rivingtons), is neither very lucid nor very good, the composition being too full of brackets, dashes, inverted commas and italicised words to suit our taste. Nevertheless, though it is not based on systematic theology, there is a hearty earnestness, a piety and a practicability about certain of its suggestions, which place it above the average of such compositions.

Mr. Wyndham Malet, Vicar of Ardeley, gives an admirable account of his pilgrimage to Rome and to the East in a volume just published by Bosworth of Regent Street, entitled *The Olive Leaf*. There is a quaint simplicity and picturesque charm about the whole book which renders it exceedingly attractive. The woodcuts likewise add to its interest. It may be quite true that several of the renowned places visited have been described again and again, with greater eloquence and more command of language; but nevertheless Mr. Malet's descriptions, touching in their simplicity, possess a power which is most attractive and a force which charms. Throughout the whole volume the true and beautiful idea of Corporate Re-union is constantly placed before the reader, for it was this idea which led to the pilgrimage; and no opportunity was lost by the pilgrims (the author himself and Mr. Charles Dundas of Clifton, a great-grandson of Lord Amesbury), of pointing out to foreigners how deep and widespread is the desire for peace and oneness at home. The record of conversations with distinguished foreign ecclesiastics of all parts of the Christian family, the careful descriptions of services and functions, the graphic pictures of Eastern churches, the wise and judicious comments of the author, the hearty tone of unaffected piety throughout, render it one of the most pleasant, readable, and attractive books of the season. To all Re-unionists we say, "Obtain this most interesting volume for your library-shelves:" it only costs six shillings: to our readers in general, "Order the book from Mudie's immediately, and recommend your friends to do the same." For it is a volume which when once commenced cannot be laid down until completed, and, whatever may be its artistic and literary defects in the eye of an over-fastidious critic, this is a practical point by which its true and undoubted merits may be easily measured. It is dedicated to the Prince of Wales in a characteristic letter from the author. We shall probably return to certain of its most important details, and to some of the documents printed in it, in a future number, for they deserve a more lengthened consideration.

We cannot be sufficiently grateful to Lord Redesdale for having printed his masterly and unanswerable *Speech in the House of Lords*, (London: Rivingtons), on moving for a copy of the Coronation Oath. For close reasoning, Christian morality, and sound Tory principles, it is unsurpassed. We therefore quote the concluding pertinent passage at length:—

"The danger which now appears to threaten us comes, not from the Sovereign, but from a political party, and it behoves the people of these realms to reflect that if they fail to maintain the Protestant cause as heretofore, the result may be that the power and position now enjoyed by this country may be taken from it, in like manner as the crown was taken from the Stuarts. Under these circumstances, and with these reflections before me, I desire to move for a copy of the Coronation Oath. On a recent occasion, the noble Earl opposite (Granville), alluding to some remaks I had made in a former speech on this subject in relation to the personal responsibility of the Sovereign, avoided the discussion of them, saying, in his most good-humoured manner, 'If I am asked to say what I think of certain portions of that speech, I must, with all respect to your lordships and my noble friend, acknowledge that I had rather do no such thing;' and then he laid out for a laugh, by quoting some doggrel lines about 'a curse, for which nobody seemed one penny the worse,' which, as I had not said anything about a curse, were not appropriate; but taken together with what preceded, I accept the whole gratefully as an acknowledgment that he had no satisfactory reply to make to my argument which he thus evaded. Try it how you please, can anything exceed the solemnity of that oath? It is not the voluntary act of the Sovereign, to which she might afterwards regret that she had engaged herself, and repent the indiscretion which led her to take it. It is imposed upon her by the law of the country, not by her own will. If, indeed, Parliament, before dealing with the Irish Church, were to repeal that oath, and Her Majesty felt herself justified in assenting to that repeal, (for, remember, the Sovereign has an independent legislative power equal to that of either House of Parliament, as far as assent is concerned, and is responsible for the exercise of it,) a question might arise whether such a repeal released her from the obligation; but so long as that oath remains in the Statute Book, the obligation exists. I have seen in 'The Times' letter a from a gentleman who subscribed himself 'Historicus,' giving a number of reasons why it was not an oath at all, and holding that it was a matter of indifference how it was observed. His argument appeared summed up in the following sentence: 'To contend that the obligation of such a solemnity as the Coronation Oath is due not to the nation but to the Deity, is a position of which the folly can only be equalled by its profanity.' What sense

can the mind which conceived such a sentiment have of the place, the manner, and the terms in which that solemnity—for so he has the grace to call it—was performed? If, indeed, the engagement has been entered into by the Sovereign in this Chamber, with the Lords in their places and the Commons at the Bar, and if, laying her hand on the Statute Book, she had said, What I have here promised I will keep, 'so help me Great Britain and Ireland,' it would have been indeed due only to the nation. But when we consider that the oath was taken in the Temple of God, that the Sovereign in taking it placed her hand on the holy Gospels, and, in the words, 'so help me God,' invoked the Divine assistance in performing and keeping what she had promised, I think it impossible to deny that the obligation was not to the nation only, but to God. It has been the constitutional doctrine from the earliest times that the Sovereign of this country is subject to none but to God and the law. Duty to the law compelled the Queen to take that oath, and to whatever her conscience tells her that it engages her, she is bound by her duty to God."

Two new parts of Mr. Husband's excellent "Catholic Tracts" have been issued by Palmer. No. IV. *Catholicism and Protestantism compared*, and No. V. *Family Prayers for Catholic Households.* Arguments by analogy are not always good, but Mr. Husband has generally managed to avoid inaccuracy and weak logic in his first-named clever compilation. The *Family Prayers* — in which, however, we miss the Collect of the A. P. U. C.,—are just such as are needed; being brief, plain, Catholic and attractive.

Sir Charles Young's carefully-written *Lecture on the Nature of the Reformation* (London: Palmer), is a production of some merit and singular moderation. This latter quality will commend it to many. We are sorry to notice however, that, like many other amiable persons, Sir Charles retains the disagreeable nick-name of "Romanist," which is exceedingly offensive to Roman Catholics, who being no longer racked, thumb-screwed, and persecuted, equally dislike to be publicly characterised by terms which would not be used in a drawing-room to their faces, by any persons who wished to retain their acquaintance, or to be regarded as polite.

Mr. T. L. Williams' Sermon, preached at the Archdeacon of Cornwall's visitation, *The Gift of the Priesthood* (London: Palmer), contains a clear and convincing argument in favour of the Catholic faith on this subject, written with considerable ability, but in a style which is a little diffuse, and rather too wordy. Nevertheless, the argument is well sustained throughout, and the practical portions of it are eminently telling. We hope it may be widely circulated.

Dr. Dykes' discourse, *Christian Unity* (London: Palmer), preached before the Penrith Branch of the English Church Union, is a thoughtful and vigorous sermon, in parts eloquent and always readable. Some persons avow that the E. C. U. has added to our unhappy divisions by its partisanship in political questions; but we earnestly hope such persons may find themselves mistaken, however much appearances just now seem to be in their favour. We allow Dr. Dykes to speak for himself as regards unity in the following eloquent passage:—

"Our Lord, you observe, in this Prayer for Unity, not only supplicates for the bestowal of this 'great Gift of Glory and Love, but speaks of It, in the language of triumphant faith, as already granted. 'The Glory which Thou gavest Me *have I given* them.' For the Gift was already made over in His loving Will. The first sprinklings had been poured forth. But it was not till the Ascension and the Pentecostal effusion that the first great realization of the petition took place. Hitherto 'the Holy Ghost was not given, because Jesus was not *glorified*.' It was not till 'He ascended on high,' that He 'received gifts for men,' and 'gave them to men,' even the great gift of Indwelling God. It was the 'Glory' and the 'Love' of Jesus, the Risen and Exalted Saviour, which then began to suffuse the Church—the Holy Spirit of God shed forth on, and proceeding from, the Manhood of Christ—God coming to us through *Man*, and receiving from *Man* the capacity of holding converse with our *human* spirits. And what was the immediate visible effect of the outpouring upon the Church of this 'Spirit of Glory and of God?' Was it not such as to constrain even the world to exclaim, 'See how these Christians love one another?'

"O brethren, when shall the Church of Christ arise and *shine*, and the Glory of the Lord once more beam upon her! When shall she shine forth in her true glory, the glory of visible restored unity! When shall she be entirely irradiated, penetrated with that All Holy Unction which is 'Glory and Love,' which is the 'Glory to God on high,' and the alone source of Love and 'Peace on earth!' Oh! would *you* really give 'Glory to God on high,' *pray* for the unity of His Church; 'pray for the *Peace* of Jerusalem;' 'they shall prosper that love her.' Pray and work that the whole Church of Christ, and especially our own branch, may yet put on the lustrous garments of Transfiguration; be beautiful as the Bride in the Canticles; that she may be 'all glorious within,' so that her outward 'raiment' may display the 'wrought gold' of love and holiness; and that growing on from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord, she may *compel* men by the irresistible force of her Divine Beauty to believe.

"And here we see the answer to the practical question I

but just now asked, How may we individually contribute towards the advancement of that great work of unity, for which our Lord on the eve of His Passion interceded with the Father?

"Our first work must be with ourselves; earnestly striving after the full possession of our own souls by that Holy 'Spirit of Christ;' reverently seeking Him from without, in all those channels of grace through which our Lord imparts to us of His fulness; and earnestly cherishing Him from within, by active obedience and a life of Holy Love, always remembering that it is by 'loving each other' that God's Love is perfected in us."

"But we must labour not for ourselves only, but that *others* also may share in this transforming Power, and so be drawn up and united to the One only Source and Centre of Unity. And this, brethren, you can only do effectually, by striving as you are able, each in his own little sphere, to build up and edify the Church of God; to lend your active sympathy also to whatever may contribute to the extension or maintenance of that hallowed machinery and system of Grace through which our Lord works upon mankind, giving Himself to them, drawing them up to Himself."

Two books we have received from the Messrs. Rivingtons, viz., the second Edition of Prebendary Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, and Madame Romanoff's Work on the Greek Church will be noticed in our next number. So, likewise, Northcote's *Sanctuaries of the Madonna*. With the best intentions we find it, at times, quite impossible to criticise *at once* all the books with which we are favoured for review. All *shall* be noticed, however, in due course.

ART. XXVI.—DR. NEWMAN AND THE ENGLISH ORDERS.

(*To the Editor of the Union Review.*)

I.

DR. NEWMAN.

"Mutato nomine de te fabula narratur."

REV. SIR,—An article entitled "Anglican Sacerdotalism" appeared in the September number of a Roman Catholic periodical called *The Month*, to which a letter is appended written by one whose name is still deeply cherished by us, Dr. Newman. The object is rather to disparage than disprove our Orders. I had hoped that this "dreary" topic, as Dr. Newman so truly calls it, had been so far set at rest, that controversialists would be prudent enough to avoid it. Thirty years ago, when I published "Lectures on the Succession," and on Jurisdiction, and Mission, (while other writers followed on the same subjects in the *British Magazine*,) the *Dublin Review* did not much respond to the earnest challenge for inquiry: then Mr. Perceval's book appeared, and the controversy seemed in some sort ended. But unmistakeable signs now warn us that the whole is to be revived.

We are publicly informed that the Oriental prelates, whose orders are thought valid at Rome, although schismatical, are to be summoned to the Council appointed for next year; and the inference is drawn that this is equivalent to a sort of decision at Rome against *our* Succession. In the recent popular literature, we see that disclaimers of "transcendental claims" for the English Church have been ominously frequent; and new defences of our position have been announced by Dr. Lee and others, as in course of preparation. You will not then, I trust, be surprised at a stranger as I am addressing you on the subject. The view I take may not be wholly the same as your own; but I believe you admit to your columns the sentiments of Roman, Greek, and Anglican writers of various schools, differing from your own, and make your REVIEW—what is so much needed—a friendly arena for the discussion of mutual difficulties.

I would first, then, call attention to Dr. Newman's letter. I should be glad that he should see how we look at it; for I do not think he fully knows how painful its tone must appear to us, nor how destitute, to us at least, of argumentative value is all that he there says or implies. Dr. Newman holds

too permanent a place in our affections to have his letter treated with the neglect which it might have had if written by any other hand.

I transcribe it below *verbatim*, from the periodical referred to; and place side by side with it a parallel letter directed against Dr. Newman's central point, "Roman Infallibility," just as his letter is against our doctrine of "Apostolical Succession." You will perceive that I use all Dr. Newman's own words against himself—he will judge with what justice. Comparing the two, the Italics in each will show at a glance the changes made. Where he has said "Succession," I have said "Infallibility," where he has said "Anglican" I have said "Roman," and so on—retaining the whole structure of his own epistle, the same arguments and presumptions, with some parallel facts inserted as briefly as possible; so that, *mutatis mutandis*, the worth of the argument might be seen.

I do not mean, of course, that it has validity in either case. I would rather show that it is worthless in both, and believe that Dr. Newman may admit that it is so. Indeed, it seems to me, that it can give satisfaction to none but the unbeliever. Let his letter be first read through and then mine.

Finally, I have no intention to avoid the real question by a mere *tu quoque*. With your permission there shall be added, at the close of the subjoined letters, some fuller remarks on our present and future position, especially as to the "Orders and Priesthood" by God's grace retained in our Church, and preserved, we may surely believe, not without a Divine purpose—let us only be faithful to our calling.

I am, Rev. Sir,
Yours very faithfully,
WILLIAM J. IRONS.

Brompton, Sept. 17.

The Oratory, Birmingham,
August 5, 1868.

My dear Father Coleridge,

You ask me what I precisely mean, in my *Apologia, Appendix*, p. 26, by saying, *apropos* of Anglican Orders, that "antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of visible facts." I will try to explain:—.

Brompton, London,
1868.

My dear . . . . .

You may ask me what I precisely mean, in my *Apologia pro vitâ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, page 23, by saying *apropos* of the *Roman claims, that "Infallibility is an abstraction,"* and *also implying, in some places*, that "antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of existing facts." I will try to explain:—

I. The inquiry into *Anglican Orders* has ever been to me of the class which I must call dreary; for it is dreary surely to have to grope into the minute, intricate passages and obscure corners of past occurrences in order to ascertain *whether this man was ever consecratëd, or that man* used a valid form, or a certain sacramental intention came up to the mark, or the report or register of an ecclesiastical act can be cleared of suspicion. On giving myself to consider the question, I never have been able to arrive at anything higher than a probable conclusion, which is most unsatisfactory except to antiquarians, who delight in researches into the past for their own sake.

II. Now, on the other hand, what do I mean by "visible facts?" I mean such definite facts as throw a broad antecedent light upon what may be presumed, in a case in which sufficient evidence is not forthcoming. For instance—

(1.) The *Apostolical Succession*, its necessity and its grace, is not an *Anglican* tradition, though it is a tradition found in the *Anglican* Church. By contrast, our Lord's divinity *is* an Anglican tradition—every one, high and low, holds it. It is not only in *Prayer Book*

I. The inquiry into *Roman Infallibility* has ever been to me of the class which I must call dreary; for it is dreary surely to have to grope into the minute, intricate passages and obscure corners of past occurrences, in order to ascertain whether *S. Peter was ever at Rome,—whether, say, the first six bishops of that See can be determined,—or whether in later days*, e.g. *Pope John XII. &c., was ever consecrated,—* or *earlier consecrators from the first* used a valid form, or a certain sacramental intention *always* came up to the mark, or the unsupported *statements of Eusebius*, or the report of *later* ecclesiastical acts, can be cleared of suspicion. On giving myself to consider the question, I have never been able to arrive at anything higher than a probable conclusion, which is most unsatisfactory except to antiquarians, who delight in researches into the past for their own sake.

II. Now, on the other hand, what do I mean by "visible facts?" I mean such definite facts as throw a broad antecedent light upon what may be presumed, in a case in which sufficient evidence is not forthcoming. For instance—

(1.) The *Roman Infallibility*, its necessity and its grace, is not a *uniform Roman* tradition, though it is a tradition found in the *Roman* Church. By contrast, our Lord's divinity *is* a Roman tradition—every one, high and low, holds it. It is not only in the *old Creeds*

and Catechism, but in the mouths of all *professors of Anglicanism*. Not to believe it, is to be no *Anglican*, and any persons in authority, *for* 800 *years*, who were suspected to doubt or explain it away, were marked men, as *Dr. Colenso* is *now* marked. And they have been so few that they could be counted. Not such is the *Apostolical Succession*; and, considering the Church is the *columna et firmamentum veritatis*, and is ever bound to stir up the gift that is in her, there is surely a strong presumption that the *Anglican* body has not what it *does not* profess to have. I wonder how many of its bishops *and deans hold the doctrine at this time*; some who do not, occur to the mind at once. One knows what was the case *thirty* or *forty years ago* by the famous saying of *Blomfield*, Bishop of *London*.

(2.) If there is a true *Succession*, there is *a true Eucharist*; if there is not *a true Eucharist*, there is no true *Succession*. Now, what is the presumption here? I think it is Mr. Alexander Knox who says or suggests that, if *so great a gift be* given, it must have a custos. Who is the custos of the *Anglican Eucharist?* The Anglican clergy? Could I, without distressing or offending *an Anglican*, describe what sort of custodes they have been, and are,

and Offices, but in the mouths of all *Roman Catholics*. Not to believe it, is to be no *Roman Catholic*, and any persons in authority, *at any time*, who were suspected to doubt or explain it away, were marked men, as *the late Abbé de La Mennais* was *long* marked. And they have been so few that they could be counted. Not such is the *Roman Infallibility*; and considering the Church is the *columna et firmamentum veritatis*, and is ever bound to stir up the gift that is in her, there is surely a strong presumption that the *Roman Church* has not what it *did not* profess to have. I wonder how many of its bishops *and curés in France held the doctrine at the close of the* 18*th century, when thousands of the French clergy, with the Archbishop, denied the Being of a God; or how many Semi-Moriscoes in Spain* at this time; some who do not, occur to the mind at once. One knows what was the case *sixty years ago*, by *some* famous sayings of *Talleyrand*, Bishop of *Autun*.

(2.) If there is *Infallibility*, there is *Unchangeable Teaching*; if there is not *Unchangeable Teaching*, there is no true *Infallibility*. Now what is the presumption here? I think it is Mr. Alexander Knox who says or suggests, that if a *great Divine Gift* be given, it must have a custos. Who has been the custos of the *Roman Infallible Teaching?* The Roman clergy? Could I, without distressing or offending a *Roman Catholic* describe what sort of custodes

to their *Eucharist?* "O bone custos," in the words of the poet, "cui commendavi *Filium Meum!*" Is it not charitable towards the bulk of the *Anglican* clergy to hope, to believe, that so great a treasure has not been given to their keeping? And would our Lord leave *Himself* for centuries in such hands? Inasmuch then as "*the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ*" in the *Anglican* communion is without *protective ritual* and jealous guardianship, there seems to me a strong presumption that neither the real gift, nor its appointed guardians, are to be found in that communion.

(3.) Previous Baptism is the condition of the valid administration of the other sacraments. *When I was* in the Anglican Church I *saw* enough of the lax administration of baptism *even among High Churchmen*, though they did not of course intend it, to fill *me* with great uneasiness. Of course there are definite *persons whom* one might point out *whose* baptisms are sure to be valid. But my argument has nothing to do with *present* baptisms. Bishops *were* baptised, *not lately*, but as children. The present bishops were consecrated by other bishops, they again by others. What I have *seen* in the *Anglican* Church makes it very difficult for me to deny that every now and then a bishop *was* a consecrator who had never been *baptised*. Some bishops have been brought up *in the*

they have been, and are, to their *gift of Infallible Teaching?* "O bone custos," in the words of the poet, "cui commendavi," *Verbum Meum!* Is it not charitable towards the bulk of the *Roman* clergy *of so many ages*, to hope, to believe, that so great a treasure has not been given to their keeping? And would our Lord leave *His Sacred and Vital Gift* for centuries in such hands? Inasmuch, then, as the *Divine Infallibility* in the *Roman* communion is without *uniform assertion, without definition*, and jealous guardianship *from the first*, there seems to me a strong presumption that neither the real gift nor its appointed guardianship are to be found in that communion.

(3.) Previous Baptism is the condition of the valid administration of the other sacraments. *I am* in the Anglican Church, *yet I know* enough of the . . . . . administration of Baptism, *I say not here, but in the whole Western Church for ages*, to fill *many* with uneasiness. Of course there are definite *rites which* one might point out, *and where used no doubt* Baptisms are sure to be valid. *But Catholic Bishops were not anciently taken from those who were baptised, as Western Christians now are, by a kind of Clinic Baptism, and the Orientals not unfrequently feel this.* But my argument has *not* simply to do with *some* present Baptisms. Bishops are baptised *generally* as children, *by affusion, both in the English and Roman Communions; (though we advise "dipping warily.")* The present bishops were consecrated

north as Presbyterians, others as Dissenters, others as *Low Churchmen*, others have been baptised *in the careless perfunctory way once so common;* there is then much reason to believe that some consecrators *were not* bishops, for the simple reason that, formally speaking, *they were not Christians.* But at least there is a great presumption that where evidently our Lord has not left a rigid *rule of baptism*, He has not left a *valid ordination.*

By the light of such presumptions as these, I interpret the doubtful issues of the antiquarian argument, and feel deeply that, if *Anglican Orders* are unsafe with reference to the actual evidence producible for *their validity*, much more unsafe *are they* when considered in *their* surroundings.

Most sincerely yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

by other bishops, they again by others *so baptised. Are they in a position to be hypercritical?* What I *know too* of the *Roman* Church makes it very difficult for me to deny that every now and then a bishop (*like the pope above referred to*) *may have been* a consecrator who had never been *consecrated, whatever we may think of his baptism. Again*, some bishops . . . brought up *in France, inherit partly from the Constitutionalist succession ;* others *derive from Gallicans of an Erastian repute at least;* others *are* Low Churchmen : *all of course* have been baptised *according to the rites of the West.* There is, then, much reason to believe that some consecrators *may not have been* bishops, for the simple reason *that not many*, formally speaking, *would by the Primitive Canons have been admitted to Holy Orders.* But, at least, there is a great presumption that where evidently our Lord has not left a rigid rule *in these matters* He has not left *a Divine Infallibility.*

By the light of such presumptions as these, I interpret the doubtful issues of the antiquarian argument, and feel deeply that, if *Roman Infallibility* is unsafe with reference to the actual evidence producible for *its certainty*, much more unsafe *is it* when considered in *its* surroundings.

Most sincerely yours,

. . . . .

There is but little need that anything should be here added, before proceeding to the broader issue which is thus raised : yet it seems right to express some satisfaction at the

prospect of the controversy being carried on in a higher region. Dr. Newman deserves all thanks for teaching us this word "dreary," if it may only lead to something worthier than the old trivial dealings with this subject. The significance of the term is great, though not always the same. One man may use it to deprecate a certain class of inquiries, as Dr. Newman does; another may accept it as describing results which are already proved *ad nauseam*. The meaning of "dreary" may vary, between the expression of mere petulance evading some half-detected fault by the pretence that the inquirer is "tiresome," and the reluctance of a convinced investigator to retrace needlessly the old ground. Dr. Newman's use of the word is not without interest. If people have resolved on any line of thought or action, they dislike to be detained; and this may probably be assumed from his letter to be Dr. Newman's case. No one would so write, while really interested in determining a question. It is when a foregone conclusion is accepted that preliminaries are called "dreary." Not only does Dr. Newman tell us, when using this term, that he has made up his mind about the English Succession, but that he did so long since, on some grounds of feeling apart from this troublesome examination. Had he meant to say, that having gone carefully into it, he deliberately rejected the historical claim to Episcopal Succession in England, he would not have put it aside, by this word "dreary," in favour of a more easy and popular mode of decision.—We are told by him however to take a wider view, and we certainly ought not to shrink from it.

There may be other advantages in this, in addition to its comprehensiveness: it may prevent that irritation which arises from the litigation of small details. No one, for instance, knows more of the exact history of this controversy than my friend Mr. Fuller Russell, Rector of Greenhithe; yet, when he detected, with much care and some warmth, certain inaccuracies of Archbishop Kenrick, the archbishop rejoined by expressing surprise at his tone; which is about as reasonable (if this illustration may be excused) as if some prince of this world should be complained of for his indignation at a doubt thrown on his legitimacy. An archbishop ought not to have been so slow to appreciate sensitiveness on such a subject. It may be hoped that a larger treatment may tend to prevent the recurrence of this spirit; especially if it be admitted, as Dr. Newman implies, that these minutiæ are not the turning points on which a decision is to be taken. "The urgency of visible facts,"

which we allege, should supersede all anxiety as to querulous carping of every kind. Without wavering at all in confidence as to the particulars which have been called in doubt, we must be ready to accept the challenge implied in Dr. Newman's letter, and follow him to a sphere where not obscure critics, but all the world, may judge of the "visible facts."

II.

The English Orders.

"This thing was not done in a corner."

To demand for the Succession in the English Church a kind and amount of evidence which it is impossible for any part of Christendom to produce for its own Ministry, might soon prove to be destructive to our whole cause as Christians. Again: to import into the investigation of such a fact any purely theoretical requirements, would be tantamount to settling the matter beforehand in our own way: and not only that, but possibly might lead to a logical surrender of all Christianity from the day of Pentecost. We must proceed then reasonably.

(1.) On what grounds do we believe in the Christian Episcopate at all? Is it because we possess contemporary records of the consecrations of the first ages in the Churches founded by S. Paul, or in the "Seven Churches of Asia," or in any others of either apostolic or post-apostolic foundation? Of course not. Is it because we know from any writings, canonical or uncanonical, what form of consecration was from the first held to be in all respects valid, and believed by contemporaries to be used? Is it because in all the Churches, from the beginning, the different orders of Ministry are known to have been clearly and ideally distinguished? No one pretends anything of the kind. Theological definitions and distinctions are long subsequent to the facts; and carefully kept records are more recent still.

These considerations reduce to comparative unimportance not only those questions which Dr. Newman calls "dreary," but many others. Some early canons of uncertain chronology, and little guarded authenticity, refer indeed to ordinations, but give no very precise information or the least definition; yet they seem directed against some existing laxities. Even in specifying, *e.g.* the number of bishops who should unite in a new consecration or ordination, "the Apostolical Canons" say nothing as to the form of words to be used, nor of the parts assigned to the three bishops in the

united act. The "Apostolical Constitutions" mention words then used which do not correspond with any Ordinal probably in the whole Catholic Church. As to the Priesthood, no one can think that the few phrases which may be found (*e. g.* in S. Clement) are such as to exclude fair doubt about the meaning; and they can scarcely in any instance be formally connected with the ritual of ordination in the primitive age. What then, we repeat, is the ground on which we so surely believe in the Episcopate, the Priesthood, and the Diaconate, which S. Peter in his Epistles wholly abstained from explaining, and S. Paul entirely omitted from all his numerous writings, so that those writings are resorted to by honest Presbyterians and even by Plymouth Brethren as text books?

Before we reply, is it not worth reflecting whether any such details, if we had them, would not diminish and localize, instead of widening and strengthening, the claims of a Sacred Hierarchy which had a mission to the masses of the great human family, east and west, north and south? To us it appears absolutely inconceivable that the Apostolate for the world would appeal for its true credentials to obscure registers, or verbal points in perishable memorials to be explored by future *literati*. The idea is parallel to that of the Puritans as to the letter of the Canon. But what apostles felt in the midst of the Churches was, "Ye are our Epistles, known and read of all men."

And this leads us direct to our answer to this solemn inquiry. If anything be certain, anything patent in Christian history, it is this, that the intention of Christians everywhere from the first, their uniform instinct, was to have the original Apostolic ministry and fellowship unchanged. It seems not to have been as much as doubted that the Church had that same Ministry, or to have been debated whether the Order of the Pentecost should be set aside for something simpler. "Let the ancient customs prevail" expressed their whole meaning in the first ages, as to this matter: and they did prevail. The ancient ministry was always in unquestioned possession. Lamentable confusions and heresies cannot be denied; but no one charges the Ancient Church with attempting to set aside the Apostolic ministry. And that ministry continued in all Christendom as a "visible fact" till the sixteenth century.

As time went on, there were discussions indeed as to the precise character of Episcopacy—its claim to be a distinct order from Priesthood—the various subdivisions of orders, as Four, Seven, Eight, or even Nine. This was not thought intolerable in the mediæval schools. But after all, theories and

words and forms apart, there was no doubt whatever in the great Catholic Church that the ancient ministry was never intentionally departed from. Countless irregularities corrected often by canons—ignorances at times even wonderful—prevailed; but the great mass of believers everywhere trusted the living Church, and doubted not that all continued in essentials as it had been. In the spirit of S. Augustine's "Lord, if we are indeed deceived, hast not Thou deceived us!"—or of our own Samuel Johnson's saying, "God takes no man at an advantage," —each generation accepted without suspicion its spiritual inheritance. The Spirit of God being with His whole Church, she trusted her Gift. How could it be otherwise? The intention "facere quod ecclesia semper fecerat," always assumed where no contrary intention is openly avowed, was the solid practical guarantee of generation after generation. It would make history impossible, and imperil all faith, to suppose that the certainty of the sacred hierarchy depended on all the registers of the pre-Reformation ages duly certified. The millions of the middle centuries no more rested on archæology for their salvation, than did the Christians of Cyprian's days, or Tertullian's, or Clement's.

It is not in the interest of one part of the Catholic Church more than another that we deprecate all trifling with minutiæ which can have no value except to the professional controversialist. There may be persons still living capable of believing the worse than childish stories circulated among the half-educated in disparagement of the Catholic Succession in various parts of Christendom; but as Dr. Newman very intelligibly puts it, we know that the "urgency of existing facts" overbears, and must have been meant to overbear, all minute quibbles. The Incarnation was a "visible fact" from the day of Bethlehem onwards; and had it never been written of, in Gospels or Epistles, it would have been exactly what it is—"God with us." The Church of the Pentecost is a "visible fact," which lives, "the Habitation of God through the Spirit," whether it has historians or not. If any one calls on us to examine any special questions of history, we are quite ready to do it for their own sake; but not as ascertaining the criteria of a world-wide Revelation.

(2) The one point, then, to be inquired of (in the sixteenth century) as to the ministry of the English Church is simply this—Whether "the urgency of visible facts" compelled the whole Church and nation still to the same unsuspected belief that the ancient ministry of Christ existed, essentially unchanged?—

Let us look at this in no niggard way; but broadly, and truthfully, as Dr. Newman himself asks us.

The English Reformation may be said to have begun in the year 1530, when Archbishop Warham and the whole Catholic clergy, by their act of Submission to Henry VIII. in the Convocations of Canterbury and York, threw off the Supremacy of the Pope. If we look at the names of those who did it—including great and most trusted Catholic prelates,—we cannot imagine that the Church over which they presided then ceased to have the intention of preserving the ancient ministry. No one pretends it: history refutes it. As to the theory that the English Catholic Church then became schismatic, that is as yet an assumption. To rely on that notion is to beg the whole question between Rome and the Catholic hierarchy at once.—Well, sixteen years later, Henry VIII. died, leaving the Anglican Episcopate as he found it.

His son Edward succeeded, and during his reign of six years, only eight new bishops, we think, were consecrated; the remaining sees and the two archbishoprics continuing as in Henry's time.

His sister Mary followed, and by her own secular power* at once deprived many of the Catholic bishops of their sees, imprisoned the Archbishop of Canterbury, and had *thirteen* new bishops of her own consecrated, against the law, without the Metropolitan's consent!—Elizabeth became queen in about five years, and found the Church and realm in the fearful confusion thus brought about.

During the eleven years from Henry's death to Elizabeth's accession, a new Ordinal had been put forth for the consecration of bishops, priests, and deacons in our Church. This was in the reign of Edward. The old bishops used it—the Church accepted it, without suspicion of its intending to change the ancient ministry. It was prefaced by a solemn declaration to the contrary, *viz.* that the "ancient orders" were "continued," and had "descended from the Apostles' times," as is evident "unto all men." Here then "the urgency of visible fact" is appealed to, and allowed by the whole Prelacy of England. The bishops and priests so ordained mingled at once with the entire Catholic Clergy in all the thousands of

* The Title "Supreme Head of the Church" conditionally conceded to Henry VIII. by the Catholic clergy and bishops in 1530, was for some months claimed and acted on by Queen Mary. Her sister Elizabeth would only be called "*Supreme Governor*" *in all causes.* We believe that no English sovereign has had by law the title of "Head of the Church" since Queen Elizabeth agreed with the opinion for which Sir Thomas More had died, and abolished Headship. And see also Bishop Tonstal's sermon.

our parishes. If any may have thought their brethren to be admitted by some less beautiful forms than their own had been, yet each received the other to communion. The Church was then one body.—Now we mainly use that Ordinal still.

The Roman controversialist who here would venture to theorise that the Catholic Church of Edward's time, because no longer Roman, so apostatized that they carried on a pretended succession, unknown to the Catholic people, administered pretended sacraments in their parishes, and intermingled with "bishops and priests" of only a nominal character, would have to explain the Bull of Pope Julius III., which at Edward's death recognised the one English Church as a living body; and he must clear up the whole of the mission and acts of the Papal legate Cardinal Pole, "who scarcely found any in the kingdom who had not acted against the supremacy of Rome."* And then he also would have to explain to a Christian nation the position of miserable failure in which, by this theory, they were placed. We think he would thus raise a more "dreary" question than any which Dr. Newman points to. The question would even be, whether the whole Church was in conspiracy to deceive a Catholic nation, and the "gates of hell had indeed prevailed?"

"The visible fact," that the Catholic Bishop Poynet and others consecrated by the old Catholic prelates using the Reformed Ordinal, in Edward's reign, kept no line of demarcation whatever between themselves, and their priests and deacons, and those of Henry's days, is enough to settle beyond question the unchanged succession of the ministry at that time. Even in the beginning of Mary's reign it was lawful in Divine worship to use either the old service or new. The two successions were mingled. †

To dwell on individual cases of animosity or cruelty in Edward's career, or in Mary's, might easily exasperate feeling among us, even now. But *cui bono?* If, on both sides, bishops and priests were rudely suspended or deprived, the grounds were either political or theoretical. If in Mary's short reign Bishops Hooper and Farrer were degraded only from *priests'* orders, before their execution, so also were Ridley and Latimer; and yet the latter had been consecrated by the old, and the former by the Reformed Ordinal. To scrutinize the refinement of insult in either case is not necessary. The ascendant party had technical and personal motives quite enough to account for their treatment of their victims.

* See Collier, vol. vi. p. 32. † p. 26.

The urgent "visible fact" is untouched—the actual sameness of the ministry of our English Christianity from the days of Henry VII. and Warham, to the death of Mary.

We arrive then at the reign of Elizabeth. Hitherto the Church under the heavy pressure of a secular tyranny—first Henry's, then Edward's, then Mary's,—had "continued" one Church, doing her best, we may trust, in very bad times. And now, in the 26 dioceses and 10,000 parishes of England, *who* were officiating as clergy?

First, as the most "urgent visible fact," that which would come closest to the Christian people universally, was this; the same 10,000 men, as a body, with the exception of units here and there—men, a great part of whom had been ordained before the reign of Edward began—many, before he was born—were still the parish priests. Englishmen saw the priests who had baptised their children and confessed themselves—(for ten years had not quite elapsed since Henry died)—"continuing" as before. That such a body of men, the whole clergy of a Catholic nation, inheriting all the teachings and customs of the ancient ministry, could have secretly acquiesced in a real surrender of their whole character immediately on Mary's death, no one acquainted with human nature can suspect, no one who believes in the "Holy Catholic Church" could dare believe. But the fact is stronger, and more "urgent and visible." The Roman Catholics were unknown as a separate communion among us for at least ten years after this. The nation did not yet doubt its ancient ministry. What the necessities of controversy drove men to, after all terms with Rome were despaired of, is not the question. The "great visible fact" was then as now that which all men must be guided by. Even as late as 40 years afterwards, our learned and incorruptible Bishop Andrewes, in controversy with Bellarmine* reminded him that Pope Pius IV. would have received the whole of our Reformation, "omnia sacra quæ apud nos sunt," if we would submit to him: and Bellarmine never denied the fact, so far as we are aware.

Such then was the general state of things in the reign of Elizabeth. We do not speak of it as panegyrists: far from that. Our one plain point is, that the *ancient ministry continued*, notably and visibly, as matter of course.—If there be any person who in the face of all the facts of the Nation's life, in her parishes and priests, really suspects that the imperious Queen was hoodwinked into the admission of a somewhat harmless

* *Tortura Torti*, p. 165.

prayer meeting at a tavern in Cheapside as a sufficient consecration for her first Archbishop of Canterbury, and a sufficient fulfilment of her Royal mandate, we leave him to his peculiar views. There are persons who still are fascinated also by the less improbable story of the Papissa* ; which certainly many Catholics and Protestants have believed, though we do not. Even if true, it could but gratify controversial spite, and not touch the broad facts of the succession of the Church's ancient ministry; and this is, at least, as much the case with the fable of the "Nag's Head" as with the fable of "Pope Joan."

Next, the condition of the Episcopate during Elizabeth's reign, we must remember, was inevitably affected by the miserable confusions in Church and State which she inherited, but did not create. During her sister's brief career of five years, no less than *nineteen new* bishops were consecrated—(the whole bench being only 26 !)—to supply places vacated by death, or deprivation, or banishment. Such was the carelessness, or conscious wrong-doing, in some of these cases, that no register can be found of the consecrations of more than six of these Marian (*i. e.* Roman) bishops, in the Records of Lambeth, Canterbury, or London. Elizabeth was obliged to deprive many of these at once, even on political grounds, and we are not aware that any of them attempted after deprivation to perform any separate consecrations. They kept up no succession of their own. The Royal mandate was thereupon issued to six of the surviving prelates, who all consented to,—four of them joining in,—the Consecration of the new Archbishop.

Very remarkably, Archbishop Pole had died almost at the same time as Queen Mary. Three of the four bishops, Barlow, Scory, Hodgkin, and Coverdale, who officiated at the consecration of the new archbishop had been entrusted however with the like sacred work in the previous reigns. Notwithstanding the irregularities in some of the old Catholic registers, the records still exist of Bishop Barlow's being employed *e.g.* in the consecration of the Bishop of Bangor in Henry VIII.'s reign—(and *he* joined with the Metropolitan in the consecration of Poynet in Edward's reign, by the Reformed Ordinal) ; Bishop Scory had joined in consecrating the Bishop of Lincoln also in Edward's reign : Bishop Hodgkin is the *only one* who officiated at the consecration of Archbishop Cardinal Pole's own consecrator whose record is preserved: (this was in Henry VIII.'s reign:) and finally Bishop Coverdale (who went into exile so soon) was conse-

* The account of the Female Pope, the *Saturday Review* says, has just been examined again by a Greek gentleman, who appears from his book to be somewhat credulous. (Billuart gives, and refutes, the story. *Vol.* xix.)

crated by that same Bishop Hodgkin. These four consecrated Dr. Parker, who was then Dean of Lincolm.

But it may be truly said, these are "dreary" details. Let us then keep to the "urgent visible facts" known of all men. The whole Catholic clergy of the realm—and the nation itself—had no suspicion, it was not hinted at the time of the consecration, that the Succession of the ancient Hierarchy had failed—any more than that the Orders of the parish priests had been abandoned. The Royal determination to secure the connection with the past is patent to all, and it was registered with care. No one imagined that it was frustrated. The Record is perfect. Of course when personal animosity and bitterly-requiring controversy came later into the field, nothing was too spiteful to be said. But it was too late. The succession at least was safe against Rome : would that the Church had been equally secure from dangers in a very different quarter.

(3.) Though the unquestionable broad facts of our Sacred Ministry are such as we have said, and the Church's continuity, as inheriting from the old days, was undoubted by the nation at large, there were from the first, three Parties among us, bequeathed to the Reformation by the old Tudor times.—There was a Court party whose views were chiefly political, aiming at national independence and ready to secure it on almost any terms tolerable to the people. These, as their predecessors had done, *used* the bishops.—There was a party formed of foreigners and returned exiles, and their adherents, who aimed persistently at separating us from the ancient traditions, and even re-constructing the Church on what they thought a more scriptural basis. (These were active preachers, and gradually by their popular ability and easy doctrine made their way with the common people.)—The third party was that which clung, at first with the great bulk of the nation, to the ancient inheritance. The first party sought the favour of the second while it used the third. And this is the key to much of the history of the Elizabethan Episcopate. The three may be called for distinction's sake, the Political, the Puritan, and the Catholic parties. They have existed till our own day : and somewhat similar parties might be found in most of the European states.

Elizabeth's statesmen appointed to the Episcopal bench "safe men," as they were thought; that is, men who would not be unpleasing to the two Religious parties—not too learned—not too spiritual—but with now and then a great man among them,. for too much mediocrity would have been dangerous. While Puritanism was on the advance, and the elder clergy were

dying out, the bias of the Episcopate became Puritan rather than Catholic. When in the next reigns men like Andrewes or Overall were appointed, the people for a time still warmed towards them, and "all men counted them as prophets." But the "safe men" had the day, except when enemies from Italy had to be met. And a short day it was.

What then were the "urgent, visible, palpable Church facts," such as next met every eye, in the reign of Elizabeth's immediate successor James I.? The Monarchy, "strengthening" itself with "safe men" as bishops, knew not that it was rapidly becoming unpopular, and Prelacy too, hitherto admitted, had to stand on its defence. Of the 77 bishops raised to the bench by the Political party during Elizabeth's long reign, nearly 70 perhaps are unknown to history as distinguished for anything. It was a hard trial for the Church. It sought to save its influence by a deeper devotion, in words at least, to Royalty. But it was of little avail. The more active part of the community at length accepted the Puritan cry against Prelacy as such. The Presbyterian influence, which had grown intense since the Scottish dynasty came to the throne, united in spirit with the Puritans; and the "safe men" could give no help. The Throne was cast down; and the Church's Succession for the first time believed to be trodden under foot.

And here we must look around us once more before we proceed to our conclusion. The period from the beginning of the Reformation to the Rebellion or Commonwealth was scarcely more than a hundred years. The Three Parties who divided the Church and Nation had all of them their gains and their losses during this time.—The Politicians had gained freedom from Rome, which was a national passion then, as now, and as it must always be in any nation worthy of its name—(would that Rome could see it!) As precedent to, and consequent on this, they secured the control of Church appointments and Ecclesiastical Courts. But they lost at length all the real power they once had; and they lost the Constitution.—The Puritans had gained the people, in cities and populous places, and a powerful influence in the Episcopate. They had strength therefore to demand change when James I. came. They had an organisation which was rapidly growing, and culminated at last in Charles's time, in their accepting very largely "the Solemn League and Covenant" for the extirpation of "Popery and Prelacy," as the hated and inveterate evil. But they too had their losses; they lost for themselves—and for the nation then, the social moral system of England,

and the old bases of our civilization.—The third or Catholic party began by possessing the parishes of England, and saving the Church from all attempt on the part of either Politicians or Puritans to dispense with Holy Orders: it saved us too from the "Reformatio Legum." But it was oppressed, and losing ground more and more, till Providence interfered; and then the Rebellion came; and the Succession and the Sacraments alone were saved.—The prolonged diplomacy of the State, never denying, but even using the Spiritual power, was the chief agent in the catastrophe which overtook our land,—a catastrophe which in the end was overruled however to prevent the ruin of the liberties of both the Nation and the Church.

We must not dwell—our argument needs it not—on the many subsequent trials, persecutions, and strange deliverances of our Church. The Restoration,—the Revolution,—the Puritan re-naissance,—the Oxford Revival of our own day,—all exhibit in different ways the Catholic strength of Spiritual life in our Church, whether patronised or discouraged, isolated or frowned upon. For never yet has ruler ventured to set aside the ancient Succession of our ministry; never churchman to take rank among us without it. How many "cared for it," *e. g.* in 1800, is not the question. It was the Gift of God, and it LIVED. And then, every record is preserved. *The law of England* still knows no Holy Orders but ours; and in ours distinctly includes the Roman.—If a Whittingham were said to be "Dean of Durham" with no proof of orders, generations ago —just as in pre-Reformation times Lord Cromwell, a layman, was "Dean of Wells,"—(predecessor to our present learned friend, Dean Johnson,)—the "visible and broad facts" remain now untouched as ever, if too often despised by man, yet so much the more sustained by heaven.

The Law of England still requires of every Puritan who would be one of our ancient hierarchy, that he be ordained by our ancient bishops, or by *some* ancient bishops. And the law of England does not allow us to re-ordain any Roman priest or bishop who joins our ranks. An Archbishop of Spalatro officiated at the ordination of the Bishop of Bristol in the reign of James I.—(strengthening the grace that was in us)—and priests of Roman orders in our own times have been licensed to officiate at our altars. The law of England excludes also the Roman priest, equally with us, from the House of Commons; because both alike are in "Holy Orders." The facts are all patent to the world. We stand on no microscopic examinations, but accept herein what all men accept. And though we are ready to make it good whenever called on, that no Ecclesiastical re-

gistration of the Succession has been more careful, (possibly none so careful as ours in England,) we can afford to waive, if asked, all dreary subtilties of exploration, and claim the plain, "urgent visible facts" as vindicating our position before all men, as the true Catholic Church of our land.

No doubt on even minute points, evidence which, it is said, satisfied such men as Bossuet, Arnaud, and Lingard—evidence which has concentrated on itself the inextinguishable animosity of the Presbyterian body—(and which that body still so dreads that it takes an oath of its members, at their "ordinations," to hinder their daring so much as to consider again the question of our Prelacy)—ought to satisfy the most scrupulous. But we feel, as Dr. Newman does, that broad facts must decide such a question as this of our Succession; and we believe that we have stated nothing which can honestly be doubted; so that no one should deny our Ancient Apostolic Ministry, who would acknowledge such a ministry at all in any Church from the beginning; no one dispute our claim unless prepared to overthrow with us all other apostolical orders. Whatever certainty the second century had that it possessed the Apostolic ministry, that have we. The fact is co-extensive with the whole history, and perception, and conscience of our nation. And never will our Church desert her Sacred tradition, but make answer to all opposers, as of old,—"*Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari.*"

III.

Our Future.

"Ways they knew not, and paths they have not known."

And now let us think of the present critical time, when all the churches at home and abroad, from Rome to ourselves, from ourselves to South Africa, are called to consider their position and prospects. It is felt on every side that things cannot be as they have been. Probably the churches of the Continent of Europe, in their approaching council at Rome in 1869, will have enough to occupy them in their own affairs, without thinking much of us. But we may well believe it is high time to think of ourselves, though the attempt may excite some unreasonable anger.

For there is impatience and irritation among us, and nearly every act of our rulers of late has, to some, seemed to fan the flame. Yet it is surely unreasonable that church people should complain of being disturbed, in an age when everything is in motion. They who are most angry at "novelties," and revert with imaginary loyalty to some supposed pious

and orthodox and peaceful former days, are themselves on the fret for changes of their own. No one among them would say, that he wishes to return to any state of things known in England during the last 300 years. None would look back with longing desire a generation or so, when Dr. Tomline was at Lincoln, or when Dr. Carr was Bishop of Worcester, and favourite prelate of George IV.: nor a few years earlier, when the National Society arose as if to arrest national decay: nor earlier, when Dr. Moore was Archbishop of Canterbury: nor to the times when the followers of Whiston nearly succeeded in Arianising Subscription. Would any recall the days when Hoadley denied the Holy Sacrament from the Episcopal bench? or still earlier, when the seven bishops were sent to the Tower by James II.? or when the Prayer Book was forbidden by the Puritans? or when Laud praised the divine power of King Charles? or when the confusions of the Elizabethan and Marian era threatened all our spiritual life? Truly we can think of no time in our story, to which any one would wish to return. Then why should any pretend it? May we not now look at things calmly?

1. The same Parties which divided us three centuries ago, as we have said, still exist. We think that they all are, on the whole, true to their principles. The party which holds fast to the sacred life of the Church as a Spiritual body: the State-party which fears to set aside, but dreads, and denies at times, what it calls "transcendental claims:" and the Puritan party which has of late favoured Erastian principles, and sought the aid of the powers of this world. Recently, the State party has acted as if it thought the Puritan section more useable for a time than the believers in the ancient Succession of the Church. Puritanism meanwhile is active, knowing that it "hath but a short time." And statesmen are in this difficulty. By the sure progress of Education, and the steadily-growing Rationalism of all non-Catholic bodies, Puritanism must be "improved off the land." What it did in the sixteenth century cannot be done again. The Politicians of course do not believe in Puritanism; but then, they are not afraid of it. Some actually like it, for its denying that the Church possesses the ancient ministry of Christendom: but others are discerning enough to perceive that it will never do to give up to the Roman Catholics the exclusive claim to the old Succession. Though it is true that Roman Catholics, being more Roman than ever, are farther than ever from the possibility of being trusted by the body politic in England; yet it is felt to be worse than folly to embroil ourselves in greater national diffi-

culties, by at all increasing the religious strength of Rome among us: and strengthened it would be, and difficulties all increased beyond present calculation, if ever the Spiritual reality and claims of the ancient Ministry of our English Church were formally rejected, and so no Religious conscience were able to find "quieting" among us.

To many it may seem to be a sentence for derision, which we are now about to write: but we set it down deliberately, and shall wait, without any doubt, to see it confirmed by the approaching facts of our English life—*That the question of Holy Orders is the Ecclesiastical question of the day.* All parties will have to face it: our statesmen must face it; the Presbyterians, the Puritans, even the non-religious many, will all find that they cannot help meeting it. To those who yet would try to ignore it, we give warning that statesmen cannot with any impunity disregard that which they dread, that Spirituality of Religion which must be the turning-point of the life of so large a section of the nation. Mere "natural religion," as it is called, will satisfy none. The non-religious multitude would never think it worth while to "establish" that. The less educated, and the fanatically disposed, would think it a cheat. The "dangerous classes" would never be touched by it in the least. The press may ridicule and fear the "supernatural;" but the Religious will have nothing less. As to the common worship "of Public Opinion," what is it but the worship "of Humanity,"—or Comteism with another name?

While the relations of Religion to the civil Government are becoming more and more disturbed, in Italy, in Austria, in Spain, (may we not say in all Europe?) so that even the counsellors of the Vatican feel that something must be done, to determine the social rules and relations hereafter to exist in Christendom; and while in our own land great changes are imminent such as no former time has seen; if our secular leaders could cast away their fears, and look at the Religious facts with serenity, we believe that our nation—a Religious nation, with all its faults,—might yet show to Christendom some solution of difficulties which, it is plain, must be everywhere impossible to the ruined Ultramontanism of Rome.*

Let them think of what England was thirty or forty years ago; let them recall all that Religious philanthropy has done, all that the Parochial system has done, to Educate and Chris-

* See the powerful pamphlet of the gifted Bishop of Orleans on the Atheism of the Social Crisis in France—fearfully illustrated by what is happening in Spain.

tianize our land, which the unprecedented growth of population, (from ten millions to thirty in this century), must have hurried to a moral decay, which had indeed set in. About 3,000 churches built in England, in this century,—can all Europe show as much? Then let the question first be asked—what would have been done of all this, without our ancient Ministry? And next—who was it that roused the Church?

It was an apostle that said, if we become "fools in our boasting, ye have compelled us." Without desiring to undervalue the co-operation which others have rendered, we must not shrink from saying, that the revivals which our day has witnessed must have been as nothing, without the spiritual energy of that ancient Succession, that Apostolic ministry, which stirred itself in 1833, and afterwards till now "worked mightily" in our midst. Call the Church party by what name they will, all men look to it as the agency which has thrown itself into the gap, and saved as yet the cause of Religion, and advanced Civilization among the masses. True indeed this "Church party," as men sometimes call it, have worked too often at serious disadvantage. History will record that they saw intensely trusted friends desert them for Rome, and yet as a body stood firm, and worked on. They have had to endure a kind of political ostracism, lasting twice as long as did the "Great Rebellion," (which once tried to trample their cause to death;) while still they have remained loyal. They have had rulers set over them, of any party—with rare exceptions—rather than that which was doing the great parish work of the time; rulers indeed often too high-minded and Christian-hearted to molest and persecute them, even when urged, but too often unable to give them sympathy in special duties: and so there has arisen in the "Church party" an irregular element which often refuses to be guided, and is even unintelligible to many. But whose fault has it been? Are they blameless who have left the Church party to itself? Are they blameless who take advantage of extravagances, (from which the Church party as a whole really stands aloof,) to discredit the ancient hierarchy and ancient faith?

Now that which we desire for our nation's sake is that the impolicy of continuing the present treatment of the Church should be seen by all whom it concerns, before it is too late. Our public men still wish our English civilization to be Christian; but Christianity, everywhere, apart from its ancient organisation, is tending rapidly to be a mere name. At present we retain that organization: but we have retained it at times as if in spite of man's wilfulness, its Divine vitality resisting

long the faithless efforts to ignore or even destroy it. But we may have reached the limits of our probation in this matter. The Nation may have reached the time when the Church as a Divine institution must either be reverenced for its own sake, or the theory of the *Edinburgh Review* (see *John Bull*, July 19, p. 489) be boldly adopted, "that the Church is created by the State, and rests on law, as *opposed* to the theory of Divine Commission,"—in which case, the Religious conscience which demands a Divine Religion will refuse to follow.

Is it not like infatuation, that men who fear, and justly fear, as we have said, the tyranny of Rome, should be on the edge of repudiating the only ancient ministry here except hers, at a time, too, when Christianity itself is assailed, and when they are looking for some one to defend even the Bible? Our ancient Church is the only security, and yet is distrusted. But if anything be certain in our future, it is that political parties *cannot* much longer use the Church as they have used it, admitting *de facto* her ancient orders, and denying the grace. The advance of Education, and the need of reality in dealing with our Social system, will show our State parties that all men will see through the attempt to make the Church hereafter a mere instrument of policy. All the faithful sons of the Church too, if they found the National Communion at last to be on the edge of apostacy from its ancient standard, would be driven to accept "disestablishment" as a less evil. They could never sympathize with "establishment at any price."

2. This is too vital a matter to be left in any indistinctness. Churchmen know that the civil Government and the Spiritual society set up by Christ ought to co-operate—were meant by our Divine Founder to work together and not be in antagonism, nor even free of each other. It must not be the fault of Churchmen, if Church and State, so long united by Providence, now be separated. But it was seen, and we said it at the time, that when Subscription to our ancient formularies was relaxed, three or four years ago, the prospect of retaining the Establishment on its old basis at once became more doubtful. The establishment of a creed which is to be gradually attenuated till no dogma remains, is the danger apparently before us. Some may be tempted perhaps to see the Church hold on for another ten years under latitudinarian influences, in hope of relief "from the chapter of accidents" after all: but such an experiment would demoralize our Churchmanship; and what could save the next generation from unbelief, and nominal submission to Rome?

Humanly speaking, everything seems now to depend on our rulers understanding our crisis, and meeting it with far-

seeing courage. To tell them that they must learn to love and trust the principles and the party in the Church which their tradition is to suspect, or fear, may seem a hopeless task: but it must not be avoided on that ground. If they compel the "drawing a hard and fast line" hereafter between the Church and the World, it will be our Statesmen who must answer for it.

Our politicians have nothing to choose but co-operation with the Church on her own principles, or such courses as must be ruinous to the nation and themselves.

Let us weigh present facts—

What has brought the Irish Church to its present peril? We answer—Its having been *used* these three hundred years, even more coldly than ourselves, as a State instrument. The Irish Church has never had any dangerous "High Church element," except the Succession, to trouble statesmen; and statesmen have to answer for its now numbering only a tenth of the population. Not speaking the *language of Ireland*, not putting urgently forward its own Divine claims, but rather its "English ascendency," the end is, that it no longer is deemed useful even to the politicians! Even the grace and learning of a Trench, and the eloquence of a Magee, would seem to have become vain. The experiment of a "State Church" appears to have been worked out in the sister isle: and so another Church, with "transcendental claims" unabated, there holds the multitudes of the nation. The lesson is at our doors. "He who has ears to hear, let him hear:" for any attempt to consolidate a State Churchism among ourselves must as conspicuously fail, and far more rapidly.

Some may be inclined to reply, "that we have no such powerful Roman enemy to fear in England as they had in Ireland:"—true, but have we no other enemy?

Our Social Science Congresses attempt to teach us that the conditions under which society is to be re-adjusted among us are to be ascertained by a survey of the facts of our present existence. The tendency of the mind of England is in the direction thus intimated; and the result is nearly identical with that of the philosophy of "Positivism." And Positivism is a solemn proposal to construct society on a philosophy of civilization, instead of any of the existing Religions. It is in truth a falling back on an advanced form of the Heathenism of Aristotle and Marcus Antoninus, in preference to the ancient Christianity.

Now the Church will meet this alarming evil in her own Divine way, offering to the Religious conscience that which alone

will satisfy it. The only question for her is, whether she is to do this in union with or apart from the State? And this will depend on the relations to be hereafter desired between them. The triumph of the State party over the Divine element in our Church would be more disastrous now than it ever could have been at former crises; because for the State it will be final. Yet little less than ruin could have been the result of such a triumph at any time—if unprovided for beforehand. Suppose that in the sixteenth century the State party had succeeded in organising a quasi-religion on a State basis to the fullest content of the *Edinburgh Review* doctrine, rejecting all continuity with the ancient bishops and clergy, and demanding the simple surrender of "transcendental claims" from all the 10,000 parish priests; no one can doubt that the Pope would have reaped the harvest thus sown, and the nation would have been convulsed, as no nation ever had been. In the country districts the people must have heathenized.—If in the seventeenth century, Puritanism had established itself so successfully as to extirpate Prelacy, "root and branch," and give a sort of establishment for a time to all the sects, a climax of demoralization in all the parishes must have been reached by fanaticism as surely as, in the other case, by Erastian philosophy; and more quickly.—If in the eighteenth century the exclusion of the Non-jurors had been the religious banishment of the principles of Bishop Ken, or Bull, or Thomas Wilson, the deadness would have been consummated, and the Deism, which our Church then annihilated, must have possessed our high places.—And if in this nineteenth century the State party with some allies should succeed against the ancient holders of the Church's divine ground—we will not forecast the consummate destruction—"look ye to it!"

As for us, we know that for three hundred years we have been upheld to witness for God in our land, as surely as were the prophets of the old covenant in the Captivities and Exiles; and He will be with us still, if we "be not rebellious like that rebellious house," even though the roll of our future prophecy in England be "written within and without with lamentation, and mourning, and woe." His hand has frustrated our enemies hitherto; "no weapon that has been formed against us has prospered." The Tudor scheme, for such it first was, of a State Church apart from the supernatural, was frustrated by the death of Henry; frustrated by the speedy removal of Edward; frustrated by the fears of Mary, and even by the discerning tyranny of Elizabeth. The Stuart State Church scheme shifted variously with the times; yet it was always

thwarted,—by the "Rebellion," by the "Seven Bishops," by the Revolution. The Orange plan for a State Church was awe-struck by the resistance of four hundred Non-jurors, and neutralized by its own "Toleration Act." That which now confronts us, as Secularism, Nationalism, or State Churchism is putting itself in order for the contest. The battle-cry is raised, "Down with 'transcendental pretensions,' down with the supernatural!" Yet we would still ask a moment's pause, to inquire—what will our enemies do with their victory, if they gain it?

First, they may rest assured that the great gift of the Pentecost to us, the power to bless and teach in Christ's name all who will be blessed and taught, will not be abandoned. The Spiritual Life will prove still to have a tenacity which no earthly parties can destroy. It is this which alone has kept us stedfast against the scoffs of politicians, and against the profane denials of our Orders by Rome. It would be "sin against the Holy Ghost" were we to deny what we know to be His Gift. If we are "to go forth without the camp," we must "bear the reproach."

Next, they must not reckon on a relief of the national situation, by much longer playing off the two parties, the party of the ancient Church and the party of the Puritans, against each other. Puritanism in all its forms hastens to its end. Whether in Germany, or France, or among our own nation, a Religion based on Biblical literature combined with personal feeling, however pure, everywhere tends to Rationalism. No educated man in another generation will be able to persuade himself that the Puritan idea of Christianity had any existence at all in the Churches of Apostolic foundation. It will remain a matter of simple astonishment that any one ever took that to be "Primitive Christianity."

So then, in any attempt to establish a religion of "Public Opinion," the Puritan element will gradually vanish.

If, as some public writers have hoped, the old Church party would become weakened by internal divisions, or by further secessions to Rome, that would scarcely amend the prospects of the State, or make its people more manageable. But what if the great body of the Church still kept together? What if "the Succession" were still kept up, the priesthood and sacraments remaining as before? Statesmen must reckon on this, when they part company with us. Neither the authority, nor the logic, nor the poetry of the Church of Rome, nor the ignoble, immoral craving for mere "rest," will remove the bar between our Church and their distinctive Doctrines. We think

we now know all that can be said for them. If on the one hand we are not untouched by a certain poetry of opinion among Roman Catholics, yet on the other we are quite insensible to their special dogmas, their Supremacy, their Purgatory, or Immaculate Conception. We could for ourselves *e.g.* be quite alive to the beauty of a wonderful work like Dante's, or of a powerful poem like Dr. Newman's "Dream of Gerontius," —inscribed to the memory of our dear friend John Gordon— (though we are not sure whether the same enjoyment might not be had from the second part of "Faust," from which Dr. Newman's "Dream" appears to be taken): but the poetry does not recommend the dogma. We rise from the perusal of such imaginations with the assurance that S. Peter or S. Paul, S. Clement or S. Irenæus, would scarcely discern in that teaching a shadow of the Christianity which they knew. And so as to some other doctrines; we shall never dare to say they are true, when we know that they are not. As a body, we shall not accept the terms of Rome: rather in the coming troubles of Europe we shall expect some of those friends who once left us, to return and be welcomed in their true home. Spain may at three days' notice cast out her clergy by thousands; but not England. Assuredly we shall remain, in any case, established or not established, the Church of ENGLAND. No attraction on the one side, no persecution on the other, can alter the solemn fact, that we inherit the Ancient Succession of the Ministry of the Church: and whatever else may be lacking, GOD will make it good in His time, if we be faithful to His call.

Let there be reflection, then, and reasonable consideration of the present position both of the Church and Nation. Our English commotion is but part of a great moral earthquake already murmuring beneath the civilization of all Christendom, and in some places now impatient of longer repression. Are not Civil governors as much bewildered by it as Ecclesiastics?

(3.) That same Church-and-State question which is agitating Europe gravely begins to stir us; (though not as it stirs Spain!) Abroad, however, we see that even the Vatican has abandoned the *non-possumus;* and will England be able to arrest events by her *premunire*, whether political or literary? It cannot be. A council of Bishops to consider the position, whether called at Lambeth in 1867 or at Rome in 1869, instead of being, as some called it, "an anachronism," is truly the natural event of the crisis. It is the *non-possumus*, and the *premunire* that should be denounced as the anachronisms. The Church and the world have gone on with a series of immoral compromises, and

the question of the real relation intended by Providence between Civil Government and the Christian Church has never been sufficiently grappled with. The early Christians thought the problem would be solved by the speedy coming of the Lord; the Nicene Church, by the co-operation of the Empire and the Hierarchy on equal but undefined terms. Then came a further experience; the Fall of the Roman Empire divided the Church as well as the Empire permanently into East and West, and introduced among the Orientals a subjugation of the Church to the Emperor and his successors, and in Europe an attempted subjugation of States to the Papal Church. Later times have modified this in Europe by Concordats; but they are expedients based on no philosophy—no principle.

In France and England attempts have been made, for 600 years at least, to ascertain the scientific positions of the two economies; but with very partial success. Aquinas, (though the contest had begun in earnest a generation before him by Anselm), left no philosophy of the subject. His interesting treatise, *de Regimine principum*, goes not much below the surface. Very little further was done by the theologians of the schools to clear the ground till the days of Bossuet and the Gallicans; who barely escaped Erastianism as stern as the Tudor ideal in England. Even Suarez fails. Among us, Hooker led the way to a broad view which comprehended the State in the Church, identifying the two, but making the Church the commanding idea. Hooker's identification of the two is now adopted by those who would reverse his philosophy and make the State the commanding idea: (and this was an inherent defect in the First Book of the "Ecclesiastical Polity,"—it was capable of being reversed into Political Ecclesiasticism,—or State-Churchism). Warburton's "Alliance" was a middle stage in which there was an absence of all definition deserving the name. Leslie's "Regale and Pontificale" approached nearer to an analysis of the subject; and Gladstone's examination of it brought the minds of true thinkers to a crisis, by probing the question (which was involved from the beginning) of the State having *a conscience*. —None however can think the complication of secular and spiritual powers and duties to be hopeless, without seeming to impeach Providence itself.

And now that we are practically attempting the solution of this problem, he must be a very sanguine man who persuades himself that the principle of an Established Church can, in its old form, any longer be maintained, at least in Ireland. To call this a "party question" is to mistake our times. The voice of

America, the voice of Europe, the voice of Fenianism, and the sudden instinct of England herself, utter one feeling on the subject; although the disruption of so much of our social system is not remotely involved in it. The Queen's speech at the opening of the last session of Parliament made it impossible to postpone it. But, on the other hand, every one felt, and still feels, that the Church of Ireland cannot be "disestablished" without introducing principles which will work their own results. And it is for those results that we must prepare. *The Church must be free to act for herself,* or will fail.

So far as yet appears, the State need not lose its union with the Church in England. There are churchmen indeed, and not a few, who would thankfully accept for England the terms about to be offered to the sister isle; but there is a larger number, even yet, who would gladly save the State from breaking all terms with Christianity; but still they claim much freedom. Statesmen may yet retain that great Church party, to work together with them for the elevation of the people, and complete the efforts of the last forty years; but it can only be by honouring the ancient Religion, its Ministry, and Sacraments, and Divine Commission freely to teach the truth of Christ. It needs no great discernment to see that all our English civilization from the throne to the cottage is interwoven with the Church. Break with the Church of England which has grown up with the Constitution these thousand years, and statesmen have to begin *de novo;* for Popery is impossible, Rationalism irreligious, and Puritanism doomed to die of education and thought. Let them maintain friendship with the ancient Church, and acquiesce in her principles, and they will find a loyal helper. To her the Monarchy is sacred—and all the ranks and orders of the social system we inherit are gifts of Providence—and the Stately arrangements of our whole polity are objects of a reverent regard. But the Church cannot surrender what is Divine in her principles, nor see it gradually eliminated, and replaced by that which is "of the earth, earthy." We believe that there is grace in our ancient Church to heal the moral wounds of this nation; and that without acting together with her, it will be impossible to save the welfare of the people, the Constitution, or the Crown. But the Church comprising within her ranks much of such various thought, must *be free to act much more largely for herself:*—and the State must ignore no loyal party within the national pale of the Ancient faith. Statesmen must be loyal to the whole Church, if they expect her to act loyally with them.

Would they have a *Religion* at all? then it must be super-

natural; everything else is Secularism. The line must be drawn somewhere. Draw it below the *ancient Succession*, and all is safe. The Sacraments, the Creeds, the Canon, all go with *the Succession*. But then it must be remembered that the Church cannot be admitted thus with all her precious inheritance, and then denied a voice in her own sacred work. If men will still have real Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, let our *congé d'élire* be henceforth a reality, and our Chapters free, and our Synods no objects of fear. Be sure that our freedom will not narrow our borders, not yet extend them to Rome. None can know the Divine strength and grace of the Church for the prosecution of her national work, until they trust her. Nor will any know the misery of withdrawing from that ancient Ministry until the day come—which God forbid—when the mass of the population refusing to care for mere State-Baptism, will cease to own the name of Christian; and Secularism, and Positivism, and the "Unsectarian views" of those who reject Christ's "dogmas," be the rule of life on earth for the semi-educated "proletariate" of this once Christian land.

IV.

The Second Letter of Dr. Newman.

Utinam noster esses!

Post Scriptum.—The principal part of the foregoing pages was already in type when a friend forwarded to us the October number of the Roman Catholic periodical above referred to, containing a Second letter from Dr. Newman, in explanation of the former. It deals with some details, but scarcely opens new ground. It does not touch "the broad fact" that the English Church, and the State also, at all times, in all official acts, have professed and carefully registered continuity with the past, both historically and practically. On the Church's part, no doubt of it was suggested: nor on the part of her enemies, until the exigencies of controversy demanded it. True, Dr. Newman in his second letter declines controversy, or at least claims to select his opponents and his field. Yet we are sure that he will not wonder at our considering what he says. It surely concerns us; why else should he have had it printed at all? No one, indeed, who recollects his letters in former years to the *Christian Observer* would be ambitious to place himself in antagonism with him; no one who has long reverenced him, as we have, could even bear to do so without uncontrollable necessity. We recoil intensely from controversy with him—and indeed from all controversy—and we are tired of *this* contro-

versy. But what choice is there? He asks questions—will he not hear our answers?

1. He asks English Churchmen to "show him, if we can, any religious communion of past or present time which has eventually been *acknowledged to be a portion of the Catholic Church* on the strength of its Catholic Orders" after three centuries of non-recognition, &c. We reply, "Show us, if you can, in the first fifteen centuries, that the formal question as to a Church's Orders was raised at all, and especially after generations of Catholics had passed away who had been allowed to rely on their validity? Surely it is the Roman position rather than ours which is unprecedented; and the demand, that we should produce in the past some exact parallel to present circumstances, has as little reason in it as the Puritan expectation to find *e.g.* in the Acts of the Apostles precise precedents for the present discipline of Christianity. In addition to which reply, we would observe that Dr. Newman's demand somewhat mistakes the point before us, which is—"Are our English Orders open *in fact* to the shadow of a doubt?" What our position may be in relation to the "Catholic Church," is a subsequent inquiry altogether. We first insist on *the fact* of our valid Orders, clung to by us through all the troubles of 300 years; though our faithfulness isolated us from our nonconforming countrymen, and from the sympathies of all the "Reformed" in Europe. None can know better than Dr. Newman that the "Oxford movement" of 1833 (the most honest natural action of a Church's conscience that can be pointed out in history), began instinctively with this fact—our Orders. The Politics of 300 years had culminated in the events of 1827, 1829—1832. All that had really been involved in the suppression of Convocation in 1717 had been sullenly submitted to till the logical conclusion had been drawn. The πρῶτον ψεῦδος of Henry VIII.'s "quantum per legem Christi licet" had at length borne fruit; and the conscience of the Church spoke plainly in the hour of need.

2. But we must not pass altogether a strange saying of Dr. Newman in this letter, to which we suffer not ourselves to think that he will adhere: and with this we shall conclude. Calmly omitting once more the examination of details, he says, that he believes that the Roman See would be justified in refusing to notice the fact of Holy Orders in a very unfaithful Church, such as he goes on to describe. He admits that the English Church is not so bad as his imaginary case, (though we think that his picture very accurately describes the Roman Church in some places,—say the Canary Isles at this very

time) but he thinks that our "notorious delinquencies" are such as possibly to justify the Papal See in refusing to examine our case at all! With all solemn earnestness we deny before God and our Lord Jesus Christ, both this general proposition and its application.

Remembering that the sacred ministry of the Church was a primary gift of the Pentecost, the fulfilment of the "Promise of the Father, which" (saith our Lord) "ye have heard of Me," Dr. Newman's proposition, if stated fully, seems to us to amount to this—that that gift of the Holy Ghost might be graciously imparted to a Church for centuries, and the Roman "Chief Pastor" might hear of it, and rightly refuse to notice it! We dare not think that Dr. Newman would accept this. Rich as he is in stores of ecclesiastical parallels, we ask him to produce any that shall confirm this, even in the judgment of the most Ultramontane of all Roman teachers. Nay, the very opposite is nearer the truth. The Catholic Church assuredly looks with charity on every gift of grace at any time bestowed on the children of men. Contemplating the various conditions of human nature the Church has always been ready to make the best, and not the worst, of her anxious charge. Of even those without the pale of the Sacred kingdom, a Socrates or a Seneca, how graciously the Fathers of the Church can speak; and how much more of those within! The least authentic rumour of the Presence of the Spirit of our God, accompanied by any apparent fruits of that Spirit, should excite the reverent inquiry of all who love and fear Him, Who has said, "take heed that ye offend not one of these little ones that believe in Me."

To dwell with evil eye on the difficulties that have surrounded us, will not please Him "Whose we still are, and Whom we serve." Even to risk "trampling underfoot" the Sacraments of the Son of God, rescued and perpetuated among us,—even to risk "doing despite to the Spirit of Grace" condescending to abide with "the rebellious also," would be dreadful to those who feel at all as the saints have felt. It would be as far from the heart of Dr. Newman as from any man's on earth: and if he, for whose retnrn so many prayers have gone up, should be brought to see how much is implied in the refusal of our Orders, he may come to a better mind in this, and think other thoughts—"things that accompany salvation, though he had thus spoken."

To think of the Church of Bishop Andrewes and the other translators of the majestic English Bible, that gift of God working mightily for ages in the souls of millions;—to think

of the Church of Bryan Walton, and that other grand gift, the London Polyglot, occupying our whole heart; to think of the Church of Pearson, and his defence of all the foundations of the Creed, more prized among us than all other books of theology; to think of the Church of Beveridge and his bold appeal to the past for her Discipline, when he set forth his Pandects; to think of the Church of Butler, and Berkeley, and Horsley, and Wilson—and their overthrow of a phalanx of deism and ungodliness; to think—nay, but who knows all this more exactly than Dr. Newman? we must not come to later days. We have said enough we trust to make it for ever impossible for Dr. Newman to write "False Church" on her brow, and enough to assert once more our hope and faith in God, our Defender and our Shield!

NOTE.—It may be useful to add the titles of some books which may satisfy the careful inquirer as to all the minute points of the controversy now revived:—

1. Courayer's *Defence of the Validity of the English Orders.* Last edition.
2. Archbishop Bramhall's *Vindication of the English Orders.*
3. Percival *On the Apostolical Succession.*
4. *Essays on the Validity of the English Orders.* By a Layman. (Baltimore: Joseph Robinson.)

And the *Lectures on the Apostolic Succession*, and the *Apologia pro vitâ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, by the writer of the foregoing paper, should perhaps be added, as they have been referred to; and Mr. Fuller Russell's *Tract in Reply to Kenrick;* and, lastly, on the general question, Bishop Bull's *Vindication of the Church of England.*

ART. XXVII.—THE CONCEPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

[COMMUNICATED.]

1. *The Book of Common Prayer, &c.* Oxford: 1868.
2. *Library of the Fathers.* Oxford: 1841—1850.
3. *The Primitive Liturgies in Greek and English.* Edited by Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D. Second edition. London: Hayes, 1868.
4. *The Female Glory.* By ANTHONY STAFFORD (reprint). London: Masters.
5. *Office of the Blessed Virgin in English* (the Salisbury Service). London: Henry Hills, 1687.
6. *Narratio Actorum Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Pii IX. Pont. Max. Super argumento de Immaculato Deiparæ Virginis Conceptu.* Romæ.
7. *Sermons on our Lord Jesus Christ and His Blessed Mother.* By His Eminence Cardinal WISEMAN. London: J. Duffy, 1864.
8. *Officium Parvum Beatæ Mariæ Virginis.* Juxta Ritum Romanum. Londoni: 1851.
9. *Mary the Mother of God.* A Sermon by the Rev. F. G. LEE, D.C.L. London: Hayes, 1868.
10. *Justorum Semita.* Two volumes. London.
11. *A Polemical Dissertation on the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.* By Cardinal ALOYSIUS LAMBRUSCHINI (A.D. 1842). Translated. London: 1855.
12. Art. "*The Invocation of Saints and Angels.*" By Canon HUMBLE, in the Third Series of "The Church and the World." London: Longmans, 1868.
13. *The Romish Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception traced from its Source.* By Dr. EDWARD PREUSS. Translated by GEORGE GLADSTONE. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1867.
14. *The Divinity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.* By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, M.A. Second Edition. London: Rivingtons, 1868.

THE feast of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, one of the most important minor festivals of the Christian cycle, has been long observed in this Church and realm of England

—unquestionably so since the year 1150. In 1549, when the eccentricities and heresies of the Reformation were growing popular, it was for some reason or another omitted in the Kalendar of our Church's Service Books; but this omission was supplied in the early part of the seventeenth century,—since which period it has always most properly had a place there. Though it cannot be said that the Church of England has publicly celebrated the festival very recently, yet we are not at present concerned with her practices. Her undoubted theory with regard to our Blessed Lady, when duly set forth and intelligibly accepted, will soon become the source of life to restorations of solemnity as well as to devotional expositions of unaffected piety and simple faith. For too many of her doctrines and practices have notoriously remained but dead letters, during at least the whole of the Hanoverian era, until the great Oxford movement arose, when the picture in outline began once again to be carefully filled in, so as in due time to be thoroughly completed for the coming day of Corporate Re-union.

To the ancient Church of England, amongst Churches of the West, belongs the credit, under S. Anselm, of having first specially marked and publicly observed the solemnity of our Blessed Lady's Conception. Throughout the East the glowing language regarding the Mother of God of S. Ephrem the Syrian and others had been formally adopted in public worship. The day had long been observed as a public holiday when the Emperor Emmanuel Comnenus assumed the purple. Archbishop George of Nicomedia * calls it "a festival of some antiquity." Assemani—from records in marble in that city—shows that it had been observed at Naples before the eighth century: and though doubts have been cast on the genuineness of S. Anselm's Letter † regarding the feast, Public Opinion throughout the West evidently so far approved of Pope Sixtus the Fourth's Constitution, as to have forced a more careful observance of our Lady's honours in many important dioceses. At Rome the festival began to be observed under Giovanni Gaetano Orsini, Pope Nicholas the Third, A.D. 1277, who, by the way, was an earnest Re-unionist, having attempted to bring about peace and oneness between East and West. In Spain a Confraternity of the Conception was set up in 1487, with the

* Quoted by F. Perrone, *De Immac. Concep.*, from the Biblioth. PP. Lugdunens. tom. xii. pp. 697—702.

† The account of the Vision of Helsinus appears in the Appendix to Gerberon's Edition of S. Anselm's Works. But the most competent critics maintain that it cannot be conclusively assigned to him.

al approbation of Pope Innocent the Eighth; and after-
s a similar organization was compacted at Toledo, formally
ed by Pope Adrian the Fourth, of which the Emperor
les the Fifth was the first brother. Services of the Con-
on found their way into public use. Of these at least five
ed, *viz.* those of Bernard de Bustis, of Nogaroli, (practically
modern Roman Office,) of Cardinal Quignon, of Gagnani
of Helsinus, and were under discussion when the Roman
iary was revised by Pope Pius the Fifth. Since the
ious changes known as "the Reformation," Popes Sixtus
Fifth (1585), Clement the Eighth (1592), Paul the Fifth
6), Gregory the Fifteenth (1621), Alexander the
nth (1655), and Benedict the Fourteenth (1769), have
ctively taken official steps, by the issuing of decrees or
lates, in which the Conception of Blessed Mary was
r assumed or implied to be "immaculate." * During
Pontificate of Gregory the Sixteenth, the immediate pre-
ssor of Pope Pius the Ninth, several petitions were
nted to the Holy See asking for the decree which was
ally promulgated in 1854. The crucial point and specific
ia of the celebrated Bull *Ineffabilis Deus* is contained in
ollowing sentence:—

Declaramus, pronuncia-
et definimus, doctrinam
tenet, beatissimma Vir-
n Mariam in primo in-
i suæ Conceptionis fuisse
dari Omnipotentis Dei
a et privilegio, intuitu
torum Christi Jesu Salva-
humani generis, ab omni
nalis culpæ labe præser-
n immunem, esse a Deo
atam, atque idcirco ab
bus fidelibus firmeter
anterque credendam."

"We declare, pronounce and define that the doctrine which holds that the Blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instance of her Conception, by a singular privilege and grace of Almighty God, in virtue of the merits of Christ Jesus, Saviour of the human race, was preserved immaculate from all stain of Original Sin, has been revealed by God, and therefore should be firmly and constantly believed by all the Faithful."

ow this formal and explicit dogmatic decision, promul-
. with all due preparation and solemnity, has been, no
can doubt, readily and willingly, and in some cases
siastically, accepted and received by the whole of that
on of the Christian Family which is in visible communion
the Holy See. Whether this fact be acceptable or not,
it stands—a monument of the present internal unity of
Roman Church, and a testimony to the existence of a

* ἀχράντον—Liturgy of S. James.

practical spirit of obedience within her borders, which many in other parts of the same Christian Family might reasonably envy.*

Moreover, when it is borne in mind that to all intents and purposes, the Eastern Church agrees substantially with the Church of Rome; and, as Dr. Newman has proved sufficiently in his *Letter to Dr. Pusey*, uses language regarding the Mother of God and her position in the economy of grace, which is equally distasteful to the narrow Anglican and the sceptical Protestant, it seems to behove those Church-of-England men who are praying and labouring for the restoration of peace and Corporate Re-union to consider honestly and faithfully—fearless in facing the difficulties which surround the question—the dogma of the "special," "miraculous," or, as Rome maintains, the "Immaculate" Conception of our Divine Redeemer's Blessed Mother.

On September 8th of each year, the Church of England, in unison with the rest of Western Christendom,† observes the Nativity of Mary the Mother of God. What the Church of England does now, the African Church, in the days of S. Cyril, did then. That Saint, in his masterly treatise against Julian the Apostate, testifies that he bitterly reproached the Christians because they never ceased to call Mary "the Mother of God." *Θεοτόκον δὲ ὑμεῖς ου πένσεσθε Μαριαν καλοῦντες.* Certain heretics notoriously denied her this title, as Ebion Cerinthus, Helvidius, and Jovinian. Helvidius was ably answered by S. Jerome, and S. Epiphanius laid bare and replied to the heresy of others. S. Ambrose in his *Treatise on Virginity*,‡ sets forth the dignity and graces of Mary with powerful words and forcible arguments. So far, then, as regards the Primitive Church. It can cause no wonder, therefore, that the Church of England observes the festival of September 8th. For of Mary, God Almighty had promised:

* To write unreservedly, we may here add, that it will not be found easy to defend the introduction of the term "Homoousion," at the Council of Nicæa, and its acceptance as a part of the Divine deposit, and to refuse to accept the term "Immaculate Conception." There is a very considerable parallel existing between the two cases: though of course—and of this due notice should be taken—*the whole Church did not speak, but only a portion of it*, in 1854. Until the whole Church formally speaks, no final decision can be arrived at. This view of the question appears to be taken by Mr. Prebendary Liddon, who in the second edition of his Bampton Lectures has deliberately modified his previous language, in which he declined to accept the position of those who saw a parallel on this point.

† On the History of this Feast, vide *Martene de Antiq. Eccles.* Tillemont *Sur la Vie de Ste, Vierge.* Card. Lambertini *De Festis B. M. V.*

‡ Lib. ii.

—"I will put enmity between thee and the Woman,* and between thy seed and Her Seed. It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise His heel." Gen. iii. 15. Again: Isaiah prophesied as follows:—"Behold, a Virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call His Name Emmanuel." Isaiah vii. 14. This verse, let it be remembered, the Church of England makes use of in the First Lesson for the Evensong of Christmas Day. Furthermore, Jeremiah wrote:—"The Lord hath created a new thing in the earth, a woman shall compass a man." Jeremiah xxxi. 22. And when the time for the fulfilment of these prophecies came, the Archangel Gabriel "came in unto Her [Mary], and said, Hail, Thou that art highly-favoured, (κεχαριτωμένη), the Lord is with Thee. Blessed art Thou amongst women." S. Luke i. 19.

But not only does the Church of England commemorate the Nativity of our Lady, she also celebrates the Annunciation (March 25th), the Visitation (July 2nd), the Birth of our Blessed Saviour (Dec. 25th), the Purification of Mary, at Candlemass (Feb. 2nd), and *nine months previously to her Nativity* (Sept. 8th), solemnly records her Conception, (Dec. 8th.) Now, no devout and right-minded member of our Communion can maintain other than that Mary was, at the very least, undoubtedly and unquestionably sanctified in her Nativity. The Church of England calls her "a *pure* virgin." † As at the Annunciation, so at her birth, she was "overflowing with grace." With the exception of the Christmas Feast of the Nativity of our Lord and God Jesus Christ, and the Festival of the Nativity of S. John the Baptist, the natural birth of none other but Mary is found in our Calendar. There must unquestionably, therefore, have been something uncommon and remarkable in that birth. For the nativities of those who are born in original sin neither have been, ought to be, nor are celebrated by the Church Universal. Moreover, "If Jeremiah," as a saintly and distinguished Archbishop of the Church of England wrote, "if Jeremiah, who prophesied in groanings, was *sanctified in the womb;* ‡ and if John, the forerunner of

* This translation properly retains the force of the Hebrew article. "*The* Woman," or "*That* Woman," *i. e.* The Woman Whose Seed should bruise the serpent's head. In support of this, *vide* S. Irenæus, *Cont. Hæres.* lib. iii. c. 22; lib. iv. c. 40. S. Epiphanius, *Adver. Hæres.* lib. iii. lxxviii. S. Augustine, *Sermone de Adam et Eva et S. Maria.* Rom. 1852. S. Ambrose, *Exposit. in Luc.* lib. ii. S. Bernard, *Homilia Secunda, in loco.*

† Collect for Christmas Day.

‡ "Before I formed thee in the belly, I knew thee; and before thou camest out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations." (Jer. i. 5.)

the Anointed One, *was filled with the Holy Ghost in his mother's womb*, who dares to maintain that the ark of the propitiatory of the whole world was deprived of the illumination of the Holy Spirit?"*

And now to proceed a step further: Jeremiah and the Baptist were full of sanctity and dignity. But neither can be compared to Mary. One was of the old Jewish dispensation, inferior in every respect to the Catholic, while the other was a kind of link between the old and the new. But in comparison to the Mother of God, eminent as they were and are, they are insignificant. If, then, they were sanctified in their birth, it cannot be unreasonable to hold with the Church of England, which has preserved the specific feast almost uninterruptedly from S. Anselm's day, and therefore theoretically agrees with Pius the Ninth, that Mary was divinely sanctified in her Conception. Most devout Christians will prefer to believe too much than too little.

Let us examine this momentous subject, therefore, at greater length. For it bears very directly on the question of Corporate Re-union and needs treatment. As regards fifteen thousand out of the twenty thousand of the Anglican clergy† it is certainly within the bounds of strict accuracy to say *that they do not even know what the "Immaculate Conception" means*, and would be wholly unable to define the dogma without blundering into gross misstatements and palpable mistakes. Of the remaining five thousand a very considerable number notoriously and very properly hold the dogma, not of course because Rome has pronounced it to be true, for they know too well that a part of the Church Universal has no divine right whatsoever to speak for the whole; but because there is nothing in (*a*) Scripture, (*β*) the Fathers, (*γ*) the ancient Liturgies, (*δ*) Conciliar decrees and decisions, (*ε*) in the writings of approved theologians, (*ζ*) or the judgments of renowned universities, against the doctrine, and very much in its favour. Whether in a future *bonâ fide* General Council, when the whole Christian Family shall be corporately re-united, the dogma will or will not be made a part of the unchangeable faith of the Church Universal remains to be seen. In some probability it will.

1. Let us now proceed to consider *The Position of Mary in the Christian dispensation.* The contrast here between the language of the Holy Fathers and that of some modern Anglican divines is most marked. Let us take, for an example, an ex-

* S. Anselm, *Liber de Conceptu Virginali, in loco.*
† This calculation includes Ireland and Scotland.

tract from a remarkable sermon by S. Proclus, delivered at Constantinople, A.D. 429, on which occasion the heretic Nestorius was present:—

"On this occasion," declared the Saint, a disciple of S. Chrysostom and greatly praised by S. Cyril, "the Holy Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, brings us together. That Undefiled Treasure of Virginity, that Spiritual Paradise of the Second Adam, that Laboratory of the union of natures, that Mart of the Commerce of Salvation, that Bridal Chamber in which the Word espoused flesh unto Himself, that animated Bust of Nature, which the fire of the Divine Birth did not consume, the truly Bright Cloud which bore Him bodily Who sitteth above the Cherubim, the most clean Fleece of the celestial shower, with which the Shepherd assumed the condition of the sheep. Mary, I hold to be, handmaid and mother, Virgin and Heaven, the only Bridge of God to men; the awful doom of the Incarnation, in which, by some unspeakable manner, the garment of that Union was woven, whereof the weaver is the Holy Spirit, and the spinner the over-shadowing from on high; the wool the ancient fleece of Adam, *the woof the undefiled flesh of the Virgin*, the weaver's shuttle the immense grace of Him Who brought it about; the workmen, the Word passing through the hearing . . . . . By no means was the architect dishonoured, for He lived in the House which Himself had builded. *Nor did the clay soil the Potter in remaking the Vessel which he had moulded. Nor did anything in the Virgin's womb defile the Most Pure God.* For as He received no stain in forming it, so He received none in proceeding from it.*

Basil, Archbishop of Seleucia, a contemporary of Nestorius, and at one period a Nestorianizer, A.D. 448, wrote in a similar strain:—

"What wonder if the Saints, whilst they lived and walked on earth, possessed such efficient influence, when even after death the earth could not confine their power. For while their mortal remains lie under weighty monuments, if we approach them in a devout spirit they bring health to those that need it. But if Almighty God has given to the Saints to perform such marvellous works as these, what has He given to His Mother for Her nursing? With what grace has He adorned Her? If Peter be styled 'Blessed' and the Keys of Heaven be entrusted to him, how must she not be more blessed than all, Who deserved (or was held worthy) to carry Him Whom Peter confessed? And if Paul be styled a "Vessel of Election" because he carried the august Name of Christ over the world, what Vessel is the Mother of God, who did not merely contain the

* S. Proclus, Orat. i. in laud. S. Mariæ. Ed. Comb. Vide also, for other passages, Migne's Greek Fathers, vol. lxv. p. 681.

manna like the golden pot, but who in Her Womb bore that True Bread, that Heavenly Bread which is the nourishment and strength of the faithful ? "*

Now both these saintly writers speak exceedingly like that which is popularly known as "The Litany of Loretto," and extremely unlike the utterances of some persons who are looked upon as "standard divines" and "theological authorities." The dry and husk-like publications of the Anglo-Continental Society, or the S. P. C. K., for example,† are as unlike S. Proclus and Archbishop Basil as darkness is unlike light. These, however, wrote in the fifth century. We can go back to the second and the third.‡ One example from the latter will suffice. It shall be given from Migne's edition of the Greek Fathers. S. Gregory the Wonder-worker, Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea, who died A.D. 265, wrote as follows in his first "Homily on the Annunciation :"—

Ἐκ της καθαρᾶς, καὶ ἀγνῆς καὶ ἀμίαντου καὶ ἁγίας Παρθένου Μαρίας. . . . τὸ τῆς ζωῆς ἀμίαντον ἄνθος. . . . ὁ ἀειθαλὴς τῆς ἀφθαρσίας παράδεισος . . . πηγὴ ἀένναος. . . . ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀειθαλής.	The pure, the chaste, the immaculate Virgin Mary. . . . The immaculate Flower of Life. . . . The alway-verdant Paradise of Immortality. . . . the perennial Fountain . . . the ever-verdant Vine.§

S. Ephrem the Syrian writes with equal point and power. Ordained priest by S. Basil, one the four great Eastern doctors, his praises are celebrated by S. Gregory of Nyssa, S. Chrysostom, S. Basil, and Theodoret. His works have been translated into Greek, Latin, Arabic, Coptic, Armenian, and Sclavonic. He is a most eloquent and powerful defender,

* Basil. Seleuc. Orat. in S. Dei Geneticem, *in loco*. Ed. Combesis.

† "One great test of the truth of what I am saying is that her [Mary's] incommunicable title, the name by which the Church has ever expressed her honour, by which so many generations have hailed her Blessed, as alone 'Theotokos,' alone the Mother of God, cannot be received by the great body of English Christians. Not many years ago, at the request of the late Archbishop of Canterbury [Dr. J. B. Sumner], and without any remonstrance from any single bishop that was publicly heard, this her wondrous title, which if it be not hers of right has deceived the faithful in all ages, and He in Whom they have trusted is not the Eternal Son, is not the Second Person of the Almighty Trinity—this incommunicable title of the Most Blessed Virgin was struck out of books published by the old and wide-spread Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge."—*Essays on Re-union.* The Difficulties of Re-union. By Rev. W. Perceval Ward. Pp. 103, 104. London : Hayes, 1867.

‡ Dr. Newman in his *Letter to Dr. Pusey* quotes at length from S. Justin Martyr (A.D. 120—165), S. Irenæus (A.D. 120—200), and Tertullian (A.D. 160—240). Vide pp. 36, 37 et seq. in regard to the position given to Mary in the Primitive Church.

§ It is but right to add that some critics have disputed the authenticity of these Homilies. Others, and amongst these are Theophilus, Leo Allatius, and Plazza, believe them to belong to S. Gregory. All, however, allow their great antiquity.

in rich and glowing language, of the Incarnation of the Eternal Word and all its consequences. Our readers, therefore, should specially study the earlier "Rhythms on the Nativity," translated in Canon Morris's Edition of S. Ephrem's works (Oxford, 1847), as also the "Homilia de laudibus Dei Genetricis Mariæ," tom. ii. p. 607, ed. Romæ, 1743. From these we extract the following epithets and addresses to our Blessed Lady: "All-pure," "Immaculate," "All-inviolate," "Throne of the King Who sitteth above the cherubim," "Bride of God," "Queen of all after the Trinity," "after the Mediator, Mediatrix of the whole world," "the Immaculate Vesture of Him Who clothes Himself with light as with a garment," "More glorious than the cherubim," "Brightness of the Angels," "Help of the deserted," "Saving Guide of the wanderers," "Succour of the tempted," "Vessel filled with manna," "Whitest and purest of Lilies," "Appeaser of the Judge," "Desire of the world," "My Light, my Life, my Hope, my Refreshment, my Protection, my Sweetness, my Strength, and my Joy." Others of the Fathers write similarly, *e. g.* S. Ambrose, Expos. Evan., sec. S. Lucian. lib. ii. n. 17; S. Cyril of Alexandria; Labb. Concilia, tom. iii. p. 1111. James of Batnæ, a distinguished Mesopotamian Saint, referred by our own Cave to the eighth century, but by Simon Assemani and by Dowling, an English Churchman, to the fifth, writes, "*If any stain had been found on Her soul, Her Lord would have sought out another Mother for Himself, who should have been free from all sin,*" chap. xxvii. n. 21, page 301 of the first volume of Assemani's "Oriental Library." *Vide*, also, S. Sophronius Oratio ii. in SS. Deiparæ Annunciationem. Ballerini, "Sylloge," pars secunda, p. 62.

2. Here we proceed to add a few *Notes from the Liturgies*, some of which may be consulted at length in Dr. Neale's edition of the "Five Primitive Liturgies."* At pp. 66 and 67 of the Greek text, and at p. 55 of the English, may be found respectively in Greek and English, that which we give here in our mother tongue:—

"*Priest.*—Hail, Mary, full of grace; the Lord is with Thee: Blessed art Thou among women, and blessed is the Fruit of Thy Womb, because Thou hast brought forth the Saviour of our souls. Especially the most holy, immaculate, excellently laudable, glorious Lady, the Mother of God, and the Virgin Mary.

"*Choir.*—It is very meet to bless Thee, the Mother of God,

* London: J. T. Hayes, 1867.

the ever blessed, the entirely immaculate, more honourable than the cherubim, infinitely more glorious than the seraphim; Thee, who didst bear without corruption God the Word, Thee, truly the Mother of God, we magnify."*

3. And now we go on to consider *The Rationale of the Doctrine of the Conception.* To be able adequately to understand it, we must have accurate views of the true nature and character of original sin. Lutheranism in particular, and Protestantism in general, have spread exceedingly exaggerated, inaccurate, and erroneous notions concerning sin; and thus, in too many cases, have tainted both our theological and general literature, and debased our ideas. Sin, let it be remembered, is a deviation from the Law of the Most High, and is twofold, Original and Actual. (*a*) Original sin in its essence is *the deprivation in mankind of original righteousness, on account of Adam's fall.* So much so, in truth, that by it all men, b[illegible] in sin and the children of wrath, are deprived of the gift which Adam received at his creation; and are moreover subject to all the losses and woes which fell upon our first parents in consequence of their transgression. (*β*) Actual sin is any deviation, either great or small, from God's law, committed by any of the children of Adam. If the deviation be great, it is, as the Litany terms it, "deadly," or as it is elsewhere styled, "mortal:" if it be small it is styled "venial." This is Catholic doctrine. Now that Mary was free from actual sin, either mortal or venial, every Catholic, to whatever part of the Christian Family he may belong, firmly believes. She was what—as has been already shown—the Ancient Liturgies and the Church of England respectively term her, "immaculate" and "pure." †

Here for a while we must temporarily diverge to explain what "Conception" is. A child does not derive all its creation at one moment and from one source. Every child has two

* Vide also, to the same purport, and sometimes in similar language, Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, Neale's *Liturgies, in loco* (London: 1867), and Goar's *Euchologium*, p. 58, ibid., p. 186; Syrian Liturgy, ibid., tom. vii.; Alexandrian Liturgy; also Renaudot, *Liturg. Orient.*, tom. i. p. 29; and Liturgy of S. Basil (Orthodox), Coptic rite, Liturgy of S. Gregory and of Ethiopia; likewise S. Basil's Liturgy (Syro-Jacobite). See furthermore Note D, p. 96, of Dr. Newman's *Letter to Dr. Pusey*, amongst notes at the end, pp. 147—155, and Scotus, J. D., *Opera*, vii. 1, pp. 92, 93, 95, 98 and 397.

† In the 15th century, at the Council of Basle, John Aymerici and John of Segovia, in opposition to the Dominicans, defended the immunity of the B. V. M. from sin. The latter wrote thus: "Est sanctificata in utero, nunquam peccavit mortaliter, nec venialiter, Christus non fuit filius Joseph, Joseph non genuit ex eâ filios, nunquam est cognita a Joseph, est exaltata in corpore et anima super choros angelorum. Segovia, 85 B, 86A."—*Septem Allegationes circa S. Mariæ Immaculatam Conceptionem.* Bruxelles: 1664.

conceptions—active and passive. Its body is transmitted, as God hath ordained, by its parents, its soul is infused by the Most High. The transmission of the body is the first or active conception. This act is that by which all are truly and properly of the one body of Adam. The infusion of the soul, by which the body receives its animation, is the second, and is known as the passive conception. Until the period of the great St. Thomas Aquinas, the fact of these two conceptions was not formally and scientifically drawn out. Hence a confusion of thought and expression may occasionally be discovered in Christian writers who lived before the thirteenth century. Even now, Science has notoriously been unable to fix the period of animation, but whenever it may take place, it is quite certain that the body is transmitted and organised before the soul is infused. The latter is consequent on the former, and therefore cannot be identical—no matter how brief the interval —in time. Moreover, the transmitted body, before the soul is infused, possessing no moral qualities,* is not the *subject* but the *cause* of sin. Deriving from its origin the poison of concupiscence, the body has its disordered powers and properties brought into activity by animation; while the soul, called into being and infused without grace, becomes, in the natural order, more disordered, more confused, and more distorted, until by baptism it is born anew in the supernatural order. Such is the teaching of Christian philosophy* and of the Universal Church.

Here, then, it may be now set forth in what Mary's "special" conception consisted. While the rest of the children of Adam are conceived in sin, the Blessed Virgin alone, from the moment of the infusion of her soul—that is, at her passive conception—appeared beautifully adorned with Divine grace. This fitting and miraculous preservation from the taint of original sin was of course wrought solely and wholly through the merits of Jesus Christ, her Son and Saviour, Whose mother she was predestined to be. Thus she, like the rest of mankind, was redeemed by the Saviour of the World, but her redemption was necessarily unlike that of those who had contracted the stain of original sin. In these latter redemption was a *remedy;* in our Blessed Lady it was a *preservation.* In her, grace did not *cancel* sin, as it does in us and all mankind, but preserved her from *incurring* it: for mankind generally redemption was *recovery,* for Mary it was *immunity.*

* S. Thomas on the Incarnation. Humphrey's translation, sec. 294, p. 159.

† Io. Duns Scoti, *Opera,* fol. vii. 1, 91—100, Lugduni, 1639.

Furthermore, in her conception, in her bringing forth, as S. Thomas maintains, and ever afterwards, Mary remained a virgin, and so her vow of perpetual virginity was not broken when she became the Mother of God. For this most pious detail of faith he gives five reasons. To believe the reverse, he maintains, would be (*a*) to dishonour the Eternal Father, Whose paternity might not be transferred to another, (*β*) to dishonour the Eternal and Only-begotten Son, Who came to take away all corruption, and so might not corrupt the virginity of His Mother, (*γ*) to dishonor the Holy Spirit, Whose shrine was the Virgin's womb,—"Thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb," (*δ*) to dishonour the Mother of God, who would have been most ungrateful if she had not been content with such a Son, and had she voluntarily violated that virginity which had been so miraculously preserved, (*ε*) to dishonour S. Joseph, who would have been guilty of the most heinous presumption had he dared to pollute her who was, as the angel revealed to him, the Mother of God.*

Thus, then, have we set forth briefly, and we hope plainly, a few thoughts on the momentous subject of the Blessed Virgin's Conception. For much hinges on this. At present the Church of England in its corporate capacity has not spoken with regard to the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus*, and perhaps it is a merciful blessing that she has not.† The well-to-do and respectable prelates who meet for consultation in Dean's Yard, Westminster, have evidently not yet realized that the subject *is* momentous. And the same, we fear, is true of the members of the Lower House of Convocation and too many of the clergy. The question, in English religious society, has been cast aside as a subject at once scholastic, "Popish," and contemptible.‡ But this policy must come to an end, and a really broad and comprehensive policy must take its place. In our view of Historical Christianity we cannot afford to blot out Mary. Those who have done so both in theory and practice have found themselves hopelessly stranded on the bleak and barren shores of Protestant misbelief.

In theory, however, as regards the Blessed Virgin's graces, position, and dignity, the Church of England is thoroughly

* Bulus, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis*, Paris, 1665.

† The ill-constructed paragraph in the Address of the Bishops at the Lambeth Synod of 1867, regarding Mary being a "Mediator in the place of Her Divine Son," was such a glaring, theological bungle, that, as Archbishop Manning pointedly observed, every Roman Catholic, could most cordially have agreed with the paragraph in question.

‡ Vide Scudamore's *England and Rome*, *in loco*, where the subject is treated briefly, and we may add superficially.

sound. No portion of the Christian Family is more so. She begs her priests and people to keep the Feasts in her Kalendar, amongst them the Feast of the Conception—but the days come and go unnoticed, and the little children, as a consequence, know far too little of the prerogatives and eminence and love of Mary their mother by grace. Concerning Miriam and Ruth and the Queen of Sheba, of Judith, and even of Jezebel, we have sermons in abundance and to spare. Their characters, and words, and history are known to the smallest child in our national schools. But of Mary, the Lily of Israel, they know little or nothing. So too of the clergy. A man looking for a bishopric, a deanery, or better promotion, rails against Mary, so that he may be looked upon as soundly anti-Roman.* Moreover volume after volume of published sermons may be examined, containing homilies on every conceivable subject in heaven, in hell, in purgatory, in earth, or in the waters under the earth, and yet nothing regarding our Blessed Mother who brought forth and nourished the Redeemer of the world but superficial ignorance, strong and not unusually revolting language, with the concentrated essence of a vulgar and repulsive

* The following verses, known to some of our Oxford readers, but never before printed, we believe, bear on this point.

S. Mary's, Oxford, March, 25, 1855.

Annunciation-Day, in years gone by,
Within Our Lady's Church at Oxenford,—
The Saints preserve me from such sounds again!
I heard a spiritual ruler of the Fold,
A delegated servant of our Lord,
Rail out, with vehement words and action great,
Against Christ's Blessed Mother. Preaching powers
Heaven-given, neither small, nor mean, nor poor
Were concentrated on the one idea
Of Mary's sinfulness. He set it forth—
A painful notion, low and grovelling—
In language clear but coarse, so that a thrill
Of pain, on his repeating the idea,
In varied form, again and yet again,
With many a clever turn and twist and change,
Ran through me, and I asked myself at once—
"If this great prelate, on the stairs of heaven,
Or in its courts, amongst the sanctified,
Should meet Our Lady, Queen of Saints and men,
—While God Almighty grant he surely may!—
He can but then desire to be elsewhere,—
Few like to face and face a self-made foe,—
Unless repentant of thus casting mud,
A work, in sunniest days, that soils the hands."
So strove I to forget that homily,
Rife with negations and strong adjectives,
In derogation of Incarnate Love,
Spoken at Mary, in her own old Church.

Nestorianism. However great a work Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon* did, and will continue to do, we have always most conscientiously and sincerely regretted some hasty expressions in it regarding devotion to our Lady—a point on which, at present no great number of Anglicans appear likely to run into unwarrantable excesses: for we did not, and do not as a church need any further incentive to the practical disparagement and contemptuous neglect of the Mother of God. If some Churches have erred in one direction, we have erred in another.

We are glad, therefore, to find that, while all necessary negations are so abundantly scattered, something positive is at the same time being occasionally set forth. This may be seen, in one instance, by the following extract, rife with positive teaching, from a recent Sermon by Dr. Lee, of All Saints', Lambeth:—

"If it be reasonable then, to honour in the world those who have rendered great services to mankind; if the successful general, the public benefactor, the scientific discoverer, may be duly and properly venerated because of their noble public deeds, can it be otherwise than right to apply this principle, in the order of grace to the saints, and to the Queen of saints? The inferior honour and veneration given to the saints, not only interferes not with the honour rendered to God, but when given to His saints in consideration of what His grace has made them, adds to the honour which we render to God Himself. The honour given to the saints is precisely the same in kind that we give to our fellow creatures, to our parents, pastors and masters, tutors, governors and king. But the honour offered to God is different in kind. This latter is supreme and absolute, of the highest character, due to Him for His Own sake, resting on Him alone, and not passing to another. Now, it is quite evident that in ordinary language, we constantly use terms, bearing different meanings according as they are made use of or applied. The bearing of the context evidences our meaning. The terms 'honour,' 'reverence,' 'veneration,' and 'worship,' each express duties we owe to God; yet to certain living people, dignitaries in Church and State,—putting aside the saints,—we formally apply the words 'honourable,' 'reverend,' 'venerable,' and 'worshipful;' yet no one would venture to maintain that in so doing, we were dishonouring God. Now let this argument be applied to the pious practices of Catholic Christians, both Eastern and Western, and the difficulties which some experience will soon appear baseless and of no importance. Again, to take another illustration:—There are two kinds of love,—first, the love of God, which belongs exclusively to Him, and which may not be lawfully given to another; and secondly, the love of our neighbour, which is different in kind to that which God expects

from His children, and which we are specially commanded to put into practice in dealing with mankind. Now, if this be allowed, and who can refuse to allow it? the answer both with regard to love and honour given to the saints is identical; the honour rendered to Mary, for example, in no way infringes on the honour due to God, because it is another kind of honour, commanded as regards our fellow creatures, and consequently equally commanded as regards our fellow creatures when they are redeemed, sanctified, saved, and crowned in Heaven through Jesus Christ their and our Lord."

And so we end. Her the first of created beings we desire to contemplate; Her we love to commemorate and follow; Her a creature, but what a creature! we praise and venerate. Founded in original grace, She is the Mother of Her Creator, and what more can we say? The saints, the "virgins that be Her fellows and bear Her company," the goodly congress of confessors, the martyrs bearing their palm-branches and trophies of triumph, with the Evangelists and Apostles of old, are, year by year, as the years pass by, crowding the steps of Heaven's Great White Throne. These were all sinners once, but have been saved, sanctified, and crowned by their Lord, their Master, and their Love, the King of kings. But Mary, by God's predestination and favour, was ever pure. "Thou art all fair, my Love; there is no spot in Thee."* By grace unparalleled by gifts unfathomable and inexhaustible, therefore, she ranks above the Saints: by Her divine maternity above the Angels. "Upon Thy Right Hand did stand the Queen in a vesture of gold wrought about with divers colours." *Ave Maria, gratia plena, Dominus tecum.*

De Q.

* Solomon's Song, iv. 7.

Art. XXVIII.—THE STATE OF THE PAROCHIAL CLERGY IN THE MIDDLE AGES.*

It has been well said that as no truly great man ever praises the period in which he lives, so at least no less certainly is he no great man who is always praising the past at the expense of the present. Unqualified praise of former centuries is often only a sign of deficient historical knowledge, and he who is well acquainted with the details of the history of any period judges very differently from him who has only a general idea of the state of affairs. And this is specially true of the middle ages. While no one who has really studied this period can undervalue its many noble qualities, it is no less impossible for him to join in those dreamy idylls which sometimes are put forward as the sole true descriptions of that age. No great amount of learning or study is needed to speak with enthusiasm of the position of the clergy in the middle ages, and to illustrate what is alleged by striking examples. But whoever looks more deeply into the matter will find that with respect even to the higher clergy there are many shadows as well as bright points, while with regard to the lower, especially the parochial clergy, still darker traits of an unexpected character meet the eye of the inquirer. The main sources from which the following paper is compiled are such as dwell upon the weak points of the ecclesiastical and social life, which it was desired to remove, just as a good parish priest's sermons are more likely to be directed against the failings than in praise of the virtues of his flock.

1. If we turn in the first place to the subject of Church property, we shall find in the middle ages so many attacks made upon it, that our day will hardly be able to compete with them. Every kind of pretext served to excuse these acts of sacrilege, a detailed account of which would require far more space than is at our disposal. At one time the king, to repair the disordered state of his finances, or to provide funds for a war, or for court extravagance, laid his hands upon the goods of the Church, or delayed the appointment of a bishop that he might appropriate the revenues of the see. Still more often the noble protector of some church or

* The writer acknowledges his obligations to an Article by Professor Hefele in the *Tübinger Quartal-Schrift.*

monastery misused his position, and became himself the plunderer and oppressor of those whom his position called upon him to defend. The Pope himself was often forced to fly from Rome, and seek a refuge in Viterbo, Orvieto, or even out of Italy, because some one had conceived a fancy for the patrimony of S. Peter. Only the fine modern words of annexation and secularisation were not yet invented, nor had the statesmen of that day yet heard of the stupendous doctrine that the property of the Church is in fact the property of the nation, and that the latter has a right to resume it again. In the middle ages men were not so scientific, and cared less for proclaiming fine principles. They robbed indeed with a high hand, but did not understand how to hide what they were doing in well-sounding phrases. One special form of this evil was the rewarding commanders or other officials with Church property, by way of saving the finances of the State. They were presented with Church property, but it was not intended to alter the character of it. This evil had reached a great height even under Charles Martel, and is evidenced by the number of lay-abbots and lay-bishops, which was one of the complaints of S. Boniface, the apostle of Germany. And this evil was not wrought by princely or noble hands alone. Even the bishops gave Church property in fee to laymen, a proceeding censured amongst others by the Synods of Tours and Vienne in the year 1060. And not only landed possessions, but even tithes were often given by the bishops to laymen, so that another Synod at Tours, in 1163, was obliged to order that no bishop should give a laymen a church, or tithes, or ecclesiastical offerings, on pain of deposition. The acts of various Synods throughout the whole of the middle ages are full of similar decrees, which were certainly not unrequired, when we read that bishops, abbots, and priests used the Church property for their own purposes, even to the extent of selling vestments, chalices, and other ornaments to enrich themselves.

Another cause of repeated attacks made in the middle ages upon Church property was the opinion, then widely prevalent, that a layman who had built a church, or had in any other way obtained the right of patronage over it, had also a right to consider himself as the proprietor. To palliate in some degree the evident falsehood of such a notion, men had recourse to a distinction drawn between the church and the altar. The functions of the clergy were concerned with the latter, while the building and revenues of the church came under the former title, and the *ecclesia* thus defined might be held by a

layman, but not so the *altare*.* The patrons then demanded fixed fees for allowing the use of the churchyard or the baptistery, and used also to take the offerings made at the altar. In many places this was so lucrative that persons built churches in order to have at least half of the offerings and fees. Churches used to be given away as marriage portions to sons or daughters, were disposed of by will, and treated in every respect as private property.

If we take all this into account, it cannot be wondered that we find in the middle ages many abbeys, priories, rectories, and other ecclesiastical benefices in the hands of laymen.

2. Connected with this exaggeration of the rights of patrons was another evil which much affected the position of the clergy; *viz.* that laymen appointed or deprived spiritual persons, without regard either for the rights of individuals or for the Church. Patrons often recognised no distinction between presentation and collation or investiture. So early as 817 a Synod at Aix-la-Chapelle ordered that "no priest should be appointed to any charge without the bishop's consent." Similar decrees, together with others forbidding the laity to depose clerks, occur throughout the middle ages, and prove how widespread and inveterate these abuses had become. As kings and princes gave episcopal sees to whomsoever they chose, and granted investiture to their nominees, so patrons of lower degree did much the same with benefices in their gift, a custom which was ordinarily connected with more or less flagrant simony. The struggle of the Church against these evils was, as is well known, at its height in the time of Hildebrand; and even before he as Gregory VII. carried on the contest himself, he had spurred on his predecessors, Leo IX., Nicholas II., and Alexander II., to wage war against simony and lay investiture. While we recognise the amount of good he effected in these matters, as regards the freedom of the Church and the more worthy filling of the higher offices of the Church, we must not pass over the fact that his decree against lay investiture, of the year 1075, was so drawn up as wholly to exclude all influence of the royal power in the election of bishops and abbots, although these prelates were clothed also with temporal honours, and reckoned among the great vassals of the State. The same decree, taken strictly, also deprived all patrons of their rights of presentation; no wonder therefore that, especially in Germany, where the prelates had so

* De Marca, Dissert. ad Concil. Claromont. Mansi, Collect. Concil. t. xx. p. 891.

high a political position, the consequent conflict endured for half a century. And even when the higher ecclesiastical appointments came to be satisfactorily arranged, the abuses connected with the patronage of smaller benefices still continued, and appointments were made, or incumbents deprived, without any reference whatever to the bishop, till the eleventh General Council in 1179 ordered that laymen who, without the bishop's consent, instituted or deprived incumbents should be excommunicated, and any clerk receiving an appointment without the bishop's sanction should be excommunicate, and if obstinate deposed and degraded. But even so the evil was not entirely rooted out.

During the same period the custom sprang up in many places of requiring an oath from the presentee to any benefice that he had neither directly nor indirectly given or promised anything for the appointment; but side by side with this was the simoniacal custom, that the presentee promised the patron a certain portion of the yearly income of his benefice, sometimes so much that only one-sixteenth of the tithes remained to the incumbent. Other patrons demanded so many dinners a year; so that we find a Synod at Valladolid, A.D. 1322, ordering that where such meals have been customary, they shall be limited to one a year, which might be commuted, if the bishop thought right, for an equivalent in money. Other abuses arose from disputes between patrons, when each appointed, and the two or more candidates literally fought it out between them. In one case, that of the Bishopric of Liège during the "Great Schism;" this led to a regular war, which is said to have cost no less than 30,000 lives. Naturally the chief abuses of this kind occurred during the struggles between the popes and emperors, or in the time of an anti-pope, when bishops' sees and other preferments were not unfrequently claimed by two candidates at the same time.

3. Nor were the above-mentioned the only means by which benefices often came to be occupied by very unfit incumbents. There were also the papal reservations, by which the Pope deprived in various countries the patrons of some of the best preferments of their right of presentation, reserving the appointment to himself, and then gave them frequently to foreigners, especially to Italians, who did not even understand the language of the country in which they were to officiate as clergy.

This abuse prevailed especially in England, where it occasionally happened that as many as five prebends in one church, and those the best endowed, were held by Italians. At the

Council of Lyons, in 1245, the English ambassador read a remonstrance of the English nation, setting forth that these intruding Italian clergy received no less than sixty thousand marks a year—more than the king himself.

We may pass over the disorders arising during the so-called Babylonish captivity of the Papacy, in the exaction of annates, in reservations, papal provisions, the accumulation of benefices, and the like; as it may be urged that the period was altogether of an exceptional character. But one abuse continued, that of presenting mere children to ecclesiastical preferments. Though the Church had relaxed the stricter rules of earlier days to the extreme verge of what was allowable, in practice the rule was little observed. A bishop must be thirty years old. A dean, archdeacon, abbot or prior, twenty-five. Benefices without cure of souls were sometimes allowed to be held by much younger persons. For instance, a Synod at Ravenna, in 1311, contented itself with requiring that no one should be appointed a canon unless he were fifteen years old, and could read and sing. This was however only for the cathedral, as canonries and prebends in collegiate churches were open to boys of twelve. The complaints of many Synods in France and Spain show however that even these certainly sufficiently mild requirements were often not attended to. Boys were even appointed bishops, of course however with a coadjutor to discharge their spiritual functions. For instance, Count Herman of Vermandois, in 925, made his son, at five years of age, Archbishop of Rheims, and Pope John X. confirmed the appointment. Ferdinand of Spain made his illegitimate son Alfonso Archbishop of Saragossa at six years old. The archbishop however never took orders, and was far more distinguished for bravery in war and political ability than for clerical morality. The evil times of the tenth and eleventh centuries saw boys and unordained youths intruded by powerful princely families into the very chair of S. Peter.

4. With respect again to the amount of education required of the clergy, the canonical minimum of the middle ages was fixed at an almost incredibly low point. A Synod at Cologne, in the year 1260, decreed: "It is not indeed necessary that all the clergy should be learned, but they must at least be able to read and sing the services; and those who cannot do this must appoint curates;" and none are to be admitted to the higher orders unless they can speak Latin, and know grammar. Yet soon after this, in 1311, we find another Synod at Ravenna ruling that a "beneficium simplex et rurale" may be given to such as are able only to read moderately (aliqualiter legere).

A Synod at London in 1260 shows how low was the state of the English clergy at this time, for one of its decrees orders the archdeacons carefully to instruct the priests, that they may rightly understand the words of the canon and the form of Baptism. The increase in the number of universities produced some improvement in these points, which the Church, in several Councils, eagerly strove to encourage and extend, especially by means of "exhibitions" at the universities.

5. A great evil, and one which was bitterly felt in some places, was the concession made by the Church that benefices might be held by persons not yet in holy orders, such persons being merely bound to offer themselves within a given time for ordination, but in practice the latter rule was often disregarded, the lay incumbent appointing a curate for his spiritual duties, and confining his own attention to disposing of the revenues of his benefice. Archdeacons, vicars general, deans, and archpriests even were not unfrequently laymen, and cases existed where bishops sold these offices, which were then purchased by laymen.

In spite of everything that was done to correct this state of things, it continued, especially in Germany, up to a comparatively recent period, so that we find episcopal sees held by young princes, whose vocation to the ecclesiastical state was more than doubtful. But it was especially at the period of the Reformation that the evil consequences of this abuse made themselves most evident. Many princes, more or less inclined to Lutheranism, procured the elevation of relations to episcopal sees. These were mostly young men with no particular leaning to either side in the theological disputes of the day, and who had therefore as yet said and done nothing to enable it to be said that they did not belong to the Church, especially as the formation of two hostile camps was the result of a considerable period of fermentation, and it was a long time before men could give up the idea of the visible unity of the Church. The differences were at first rather esteemed as those of various schools in one body. But in cases where a youth of one of the reforming princely houses had obtained a bishopric, people waited in vain for the day when he should take orders. He remained a layman, and then seized the first convenient moment to introduce Protestantism into his chapter, and to convert the ecclesiastical into a temporal principality.

But in spite of this sad experience the evil continued, and it was long by no means uncommon in Germany to find

bishops who had never been ordained, the highest posts in the Church having become mere perquisites of the nobility. As long as the bishoprics and other high ecclesiastical dignities were endowed with considerable revenues, they were taken possession of by, or for, those whose main care was the wool and not the sheep; and the celebrated saying of the great Cardinal Bartholomew Pacca, shortly before his death, has been fully justified—*viz.* that the secularisation of her property has done the Church in Germany at least this good, that those who have no vocation no longer thrust themselves into Church offices.

6. Again, as in so many other matters, so too with respect to the revenues of the clergy, the middle ages were a time of the greatest contrasts. Crœsus and Irus, prince and beggar, were side by side. It is well known that often, especially in Germany, bishops and abbots bore temporal rule over various counties and principalities, and the ablest emperors rather strove to increase the influence of the ecclesiastical magnates, to have in them a counterpoise to the centrifugal tendencies of the temporal princes. But there were not many countries which had such powerful and wealthy bishops as Germany. It was otherwise in Italy, where the number of dioceses was so great that the bishops were always poor. But episcopal poverty was most conspicious of all in Scotland and Ireland, where the whole possessions of the princes of the Church sometimes consisted of only a few cows.

The chief source of income for the parochial clergy especially was the tithe, which was required of every production of corn, wine, fruit, wood, cattle, wool, butter, cheese, &c. Besides this the parish church used to demand a tithe on the opening of a new quarry. And the regulations exacting the due payment of tithes were very stringent, and the punishment for non-payment severe, mounting to excommunication itself.

It is no more than one would expect to find, from the character of that period, that the powerful nobles often deprived the clergy of their dues, but it seems somewhat strange that in this respect the monks were at least as bad as the nobles. Not only did they refuse to pay the tithes which were due from their property to the various parochial clergy, but they stirred up the laity to similar wrong doing, and not unfrequently, especially the mendicant orders, preached against the right of the secular clergy to tithes. Many went a step further, and persuaded the laity for the future to pay the tithes to themselves, which produced from Pope Clement V. the Bull

Religiosi: several Synods also condemned the unjust and grasping behaviour of the monks.

Another source of income to the parochial clergy was what we should now call fees, though the tendency of ecclesiastical legislation in the middle ages was decidedly opposed to such claims. The bishops especially were most strictly forbidden to demand any money or money's worth for ordination, or even to receive a present; a stringency which we can easily understand, when we remember how hard a struggle was being carried on against simony in all its ramifications. In the same spirit the bishop was forbidden to demand or receive anything for the consecration of churches, for distributing the chrism to the clergy, for consecrating bells, &c., &c. There was less strictness with regard to parochial fees, as naturally here the danger of simony was more remote. Yet some Synods forbade fees altogether, even in the form of free-will gifts, especially for baptisms, as experience had shown that many children died unbaptised because the expenses of baptism were too great (of which however the fees were but a small portion). Other Synods spoke less precisely, and did not in words forbid the reception of presents. But the majority of the Canons upon this subject allow the reception of free-will offerings for sacraments and sacramental rites, with the reservation that nothing might be received till *after* the function. With respect to burials it was specially decreed that nothing might be demanded for the grave, and that the parish priest must bury the poor at his own cost.

It was natural, that when voluntary presents had become customary, they should eventually in some places assume the nature of fees; it thus became necessary to determine how much the parish priest might demand in a given case. A Synod at Trèves in 1310, while fixing a sum which the priest was not to exceed, added that in the case of the poor he must be contented with less, and that where a higher or lower scale was customary, it must be still kept to.

In taking into consideration the complaints sometimes made of a grasping disposition on the part of the clergy, we must not forget their poverty, and that the monks had contrived to divert a considerable portion even of this source of income into their own coffers, by persuading rich laity to be buried in the monastic churches, so that the fees were paid to the monks, and a very small proportion ever found its way to the hands of those who had most right to the whole.

7. The sources from which we may infer the poverty of the parochial clergy are very numerous.

(*a*) The richest benefices were in the hands of the monks, who had become rich, while the secular clergy had grown poor. A Synod of Mayence in 1261 complained of this, and endeavoured to check the abuse, ordering that no benefices should henceforward be given to the monks, and that such as were already in their hands should be served by *vicarii perpetui*, vicars, or in modern language "perpetual curates."

(*b*) If a church was tolerably well endowed, it was not unusual to appoint several clergy to it, dividing the income among them. Several Synods protested against this, requiring rather that when a benefice was too poor, it should be united to another, but ordering also that in rich benefices, with widely spread population, more clergy should be appointed.

(*c*) A cause of special evil to the Church was also the custom that incumbents of good families seldom discharged the duties of their office in person, but appointed curates, to whom they gave a yearly stipend as miserably insufficient as is too often the case at the present day. A whole series of canons rendered this state of things at least so far more tolerable, inasmuch as they provided that the curate should not be removable at the will of the incumbent, and that he should receive a fixed and sufficient share of the revenues of the benefice. In 1222 the Synod of Oxford fixed the sum at not less than five marks a year.

(*d*) A consequence of the smallness of the revenues of the benefices was that many clergy wholly refused to accept them, or a fixed post in any church, preferring to live as private persons upon the fees derived from saying masses, and money earned in other ways. Especially was this the case in England, where the custom of annals or annuals afforded a subsistence. These were foundations for providing a mass daily for a year for some person living or departed, and they were preferred by many to a fixed benefice. Archbishop Simon of Canterbury, in 1362, complained that they were the cause of many benefices remaining without incumbents, and ordered that all priests should undertake the cure of souls at the bishop's command, on pain of suspension. He also ordered that for annals no more than five marks a year should be paid, while incumbents with cure of souls should receive six. In 1378 it became however again necessary for the Archbishop of Canterbury to allow for annals seven marks a year, or board and three marks; and for incumbents eight marks, or board and four marks, except where the bishop of the diocese should order otherwise.

And any person demanding more was *ipso facto* excommunicate.

(*e*) While in England there were thus many benefices lacking clergy, other countries suffered from precisely the opposite, there being many clergy who could obtain absolutely no clerical occupation at all. Consequently, many clergy gained their living by begging, or in some other still more disreputable manner. The same evil occurred where benefices were too poorly endowed, or more priests were appointed to one church than its revenues could support. In Italy even Canons of Cathedrals were at times obliged to beg.

8. Partly from poverty and partly from avarice, many of the clergy resorted to means of increasing their incomes which accorded little with their character, and could only result in bringing discredit on their order. They entered the families of laymen as secretaries, or in some other capacity; sometimes even as a sort of lacqueys to the noble ladies, whose hawks they tended. Others wandered about the country as jesters or buffoons, or went from church to church, seeking everywhere occupation for a few weeks or months. Many again lent money on usury, or sold wine, wholesale and retail, or kept public-houses, not to mention gambling places and brothels. Others of somewhat higher position acted as lawyers or doctors, some few became civil *employés*, or even ministers of state, while a larger number earned a subsistence as secretaries of the law-courts, in spite of the canons which forbad the clergy from taking even so indirect a part in shedding blood as is implied in writing out death-warrants.

Poverty or avarice were again the causes which led many to make gain by the most barefaced and superstitious impostures. The prevailing belief that it was possible to pray a person to death, especially by the use of the magnificent sequence *Media vita*, "In the midst of life we are in death," induced some priests to make a practice of saying for some one still alive a mass for the dead, to the intent that he might soon die. A bier was placed in the church, inscribed with the name of the person who was to be prayed to death, and the office and mass for the dead, &c., were then sung.

Another means of making more money was to say several masses in one day, and when this was forbidden, the greedy clergy invented the *missæ bifaciatæ* or *trifaciatæ*, in which they read rapidly two or three masses one after the other, as far as the canon, and then the canon once for all. This practice was also of course soon forbidden, as was also

the lucrative custom of selling the consecrated oils as medicine.

Last of all we may mention the fact that it sometimes happened that certain of the clergy, whether from poverty or want of a sufficient sense of decency, used to celebrate without shoes or stockings, or with unlighted candles, while the Armenians were charged with celebrating (perhaps for fear of the Turks) in their ordinary dress.

There still remain very interesting details affecting the clergy of the middle ages, which we hope to revert to in a future article.

Art. XXIX.—ON THE DOUBLE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST FROM THE FATHER AND THE SON.

When we, who are but limited and mortal creatures, presume to discourse concerning the ineffable mysteries of the Godhead, it would seem as though we were almost guilty of blasphemy, for how shall the creature comprehend the Creator, how shall a limited being conceive the Infinite Author of all Being, or how shall poor mortal man dare to speak of his God, as if he were cognisant of that Divine Nature, or as though he could comprehend that sublime and infinitely perfect Substance, which all the visible creation proclaims, but which immeasurably transcends all human thought? Truly in approaching such a subject, we draw nigh to that threshold before which it is our bounden duty to bow down in the lowest adoration, for we come into a Presence before which the angelic hosts veil their faces and in trembling awe adore. And yet the Christian, who has been baptised, as Christ our Lord commanded, *in the "Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,"* has surely the high duty to proclaim the glory of this Triune God, this Trinity in Unity, this one only Divine Substance, existing in three Persons, one only God blessed for evermore.

But how shall the Christian rightly confess the orthodox faith, if he swerve from the primitive fountain of Divine Revelation, contained in Holy Scripture, and handed down in its true meaning by the ceaseless and universal testimony of the Catholic Church of Christ?

Ever since the time of Charlemagne, the Christian world has been divided by the insertion of two words into the Creed —the *Filioque*. The question is, was the insertion an expression of truth or of error, was it made by a competent authority or was it not?

In our endeavour to reply to these two questions, our object will be not only to defend our own view of the doctrine, that is, the Latin view, but to show that in holding it there is nothing that presents an insurmountable barrier between our separated Greek brethren and ourselves.

The Greeks maintain that in the Godhead there is but one Principium or ἀρχὴ, and that this Root or Fountain of the Godhead is the Father and the Father alone. That as,

therefore, the Father is the Source from which eternally the Son hath sprung, so it is from Him and from Him alone, as *Source* and *Origin of* the Divinity, that the. Holy Ghost eternally proceeds.

In this capital truth both Greeks and Latins are agreed; in upholding it, the orthodoxy of the Greeks is not contested by the Latins, but on the contrary it is confirmed. The question between us is a further one, whether, subordinate to this grand truth, there be not in the production of the Holy Spirit, the third Person of the Blessed Trinity, a concurrence between the Father and the Son? whether the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father alone as the source and origin of the whole Godhead, does not also proceed by virtue of this one spiration, simultaneously and eternally from the Son concurring with the Divine Father?

This is what the Latins affirm and what the Greeks deny.

In affirming it the Latins rely not upon any abstract metaphysical reasoning, starting from a given datum, but they assert that the statements of Holy Scripture, and the tradition of the Church in expounding their meaning, render such a conclusion necessary: and though the Greek statement may seem simpler and more in conformity with the other grand truth, that the Father alone is the root and principle of the whole Godhead, still it is impossible to explain the statements contained in several texts of Holy Scripture, or to admit the orthodoxy of several Holy Fathers of the Church, except on the admission that the Holy Ghost proceeds eternally from the Son as well as from the Father. But then as the Father is the sole origin of the Son, so also is the Father the sole origin of what proceeds from the Son.

It is a great mystery, impenetrable to human comprehension, but it is revealed to us in Scripture in our Lord's own words, and it has been handed down and discoursed on by some of the greatest of the Fathers, long before it was added to the Creed. Their orthodoxy could not be maintained, if the dogma itself were erroneous; but this dogma is perfectly consistent with the silence of others of the Fathers, and with the simpler and original statement of the Creed. So much so, that many Greek Theologians confine their objections mainly to the insertion of the words *Filioque* into the Creed, and not so much to the statement itself viewed as a theological proposition.

Let us now proceed to the texts of Holy Scripture on which the dogma is grounded, but in doing so let us quote

that greatest of all Doctors and Fathers, the glorious S. Augustine.

In his great treatise on the Holy Trinity, that blessed Father of the Church* thus expresses himself:—

"As, therefore, the Father begat, so the Son is begotten: so also the Father hath sent, and the Son is sent. But like as He who begat, and He who is begotten, so also He who sent and He who was sent are *One*. For the Father and the Son are *One*. So also the Holy Ghost is *One* with them. For these three are *One*. For like as *to be born* is to the Son, that He is from the Father; so to *be sent* is to the Son, that He be known to be from Him. And like as to the Holy Ghost that He is the Gift of God, is that He proceeds from the Father: so to be sent, is to be known that He proceedeth from Him. Nor can we say, *that the Holy Ghost does not also proceed from the Son.* [Remember, O reader, that these words of the holy Doctor were written centuries before the time of Charlemagne, and what Greek author has ever dared to question the orthodoxy of the great Augustine?] For it is not in vain that the same Spirit is called the Spirit both of the Father and of the Son. Nor do I see what else He meant to signify, when breathing on the face of His Disciples He said: *Receive ye the Holy Ghost.* For it was not that corporeal breathing, proceeding from the Body with the sense of corporeal contact, that constituted the substance of the Holy Ghost: but it was a demonstration by an appropriate

* De Trinitate, lib. iv. cap. 29. Sicut ergo Pater genuit, Filius genitus est, ita Pater misit, Filius missus est. Sed quemadmodum qui genuit et qui genitus est, ita et qui misit et qui missus est Unum sunt; quia Pater et Filius Unum sunt. Ita etiam Spiritus Sanctus Unum cum eis est; quia hæc tria Unum sunt. Sicut enim natum esse est Filio, à Patre esse; ita mitti est Filio, cognosci quòd ab Illo sit. Et sicut Spiritui Sancto Donum Dei esse, est à Patre procedere; ita mitti, est cognosci quia ab Illo procedat. *Nec possumus dicere quòd Spiritus Sanctus et a Filio non procedat:* neque enim frustra idem Spiritus et Patris et Filii Spiritus dicitur. Nec video, quid aliud significare voluerit, cum sufflans in faciem discipulorum ait: *Accipite Spiritum Sanctum.* Neque enim flatus ille corporeus, cum sensu corporalitèr tangendi procedens ex corpore, substantia Spiritus Sancti fuit; sed demonstratio per congruam significationem, *non tantum à Patre, sed et à Filio procedere Spiritum Sanctum.* Quis enim dementissimus dixerit, alium fuisse Spiritum, quem sufflans dedit, et alium quem post Ascensionem Suam misit? *Unus enim est Spiritus Dei, Spiritus Patris et Filii,* Spiritus Sanctus, qui operatur omnia in omnibus. Sed quòd bis datus est, dispensatio certe significationis fuit, de qua suo loco, quantum Dominus dederit, disseremus. Quod ergo ait Dominus, *Quem ego mittam vobis a Patre;* ostendit *Spiritum et Patris et Filii.* Quià etiam cum dixisset, *Quem mittet Pater,* addidit, *in Nomine Meo;* non tamen dixit, quem mittet Pater à Me: quemadmodum dixit, *Quem Ego mittam vobis à Patre:* videlicet ostendens quod totius Divinitatis, vel si melius dicitur, Deitatis, principium Pater est. Qui ergo a Patre procedit et Filio, ad Eum refertur à quo natus est Filius.

external sign, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth not alone from the Father, but also from the Son. For who is there so supremely mad as to affirm that it was one Spirit, which He gave in breathing, and another, which He sent after His Ascension? For the Spirit of God is One, the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, the Holy Spirit, that operates all things in all. But that He was twice given, was a dispensation of great significance, concerning which in its proper place, as the Lord shall vouchsafe unto us, we will discourse hereafter. Whereas then our Lord saith, '*Whom I will send unto you from the Father*'' He shows that it is the Spirit both of the Father and the Son. For also when He said, '*whom the Father will send*,' He added, '*in My Name;*' He did not however say, whom the Father will send from Me: as He had said, '*whom I will send you from the Father:*' for he meant to show, that the Father is the Principle of the whole Divinity, or to speak more accurately, of the whole Godhead. He then, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, is referred back to Him from whom the Son Himself was born."

And again in another treatise,* S. Augustine says, "Cur non credamus, quod etiam de Filio procedat Spiritus Sanctus, cum Filii quoque ipse sit Spiritus?" "Why should we not believe, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth also from the Son, seeing that He is the Spirit of the Son also?" The reason is evident, replies S. Alphonso Liguori to this question, "We cannot say that the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the Son by reason of his consubstantiality with the Son; for the Son, being also consubstantial with the Holy Ghost, would on this reasoning be called the Spirit of the Holy Ghost. Neither can he called the Spirit of the Son, as though He were the instrument or the external manifestation of the sanctity of the Son, for such an explanation is repugnant to the very nature of the Divine Persons. He is then termed in Holy Scripture the Spirit of the Son, because He proceeds from Him."†

And further on S. Alphonso continues, "We find another proof also in those texts, where it is said, that the Son hath all that the Father possesseth and that the Holy Ghost *receives* from the Son. Let us quote the whole passage from S. John's Gospel (xvi. 13.) 'But when the Spirit of Truth shall come, He shall teach you all truth; for He shall not speak from Himself, but whatsoever He shall hear He shall speak, and He shall announce unto you the things that are about to come to pass. He shall glorify Me, for He shall

* S. Augustini, *Tract* 99 *in Joannem.*

† S. Alphonso Liguori, *Refutation des Heresies*, vol. xxi. p. 71.

receive of mine and shall declare unto you. All things, whatsoever the Father hath, are mine, on account of which I said, that *He shall receive of mine*, and shall declare unto you.' Now let us here observe the expression *de Meo accipiet, He shall receive of* Mine. When we are speaking of the Divine Persons, we cannot say that one of them receives from another, otherwise than by way of *Procession*. To *receive* from, and to *proceed* from, are one and the same thing. In fact would it not be an evident absurdity to say, that the Holy Ghost, who is God as much as the Son, receives from Him knowledge and wisdom? And yet it is written that He receives from the Son. What then is it that He receives from the Son? Clearly it is the nature and all the attributes of the Son, that He receiveth from Him; in a word, He proceeds from Him."

The Greek theologians reply to this argument of S. Alphonso, that in the text which we have cited, our Saviour does not say that the Holy Ghost "receives from *Me*," but "from *Mine*" or "of *Mine*," that is to say, "*from My Father*." Our answer to this is, that our Saviour explains the text by the words that follow: "*All things, whatsoever the Father hath*, are *Mine*; on that account I said unto you: that He [the Holy Spirit] shall receive from *Mine*, and shall declare unto you." From these words we see that the Holy Spirit receiveth from that which is the Son's, "de Meo accipiet," and our Lord declares that He hath all things that the Father hath: how so, if He hath not in common with the Father the production of the Holy Spirit? The Greeks reply, what the Latins equally admit, that the term "all things" is not so absolute as not to exclude something that belongeth to the Father, that it excludes, of course, the Paternity of the Father, for that otherwise the relative distinction of the Persons—the Father from the Son—would be annihilated, which would overthrow the doctrine of the blessed Trinity itself. So far, I say, we Latins agree with our separated Greek brethren; but when they go a step further, and say that the Procession of the Holy Spirit is also excluded from that comprehensive term, "*Omnia*, quæcumque habet Pater, *Mea* sunt," even as the relative Personal Distinction is excluded, we simply reply, WHY? what necessity is there for that? If indeed we Latins contended, that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Son, as from the Root and Source of the Godhead, we should simply be forgetting that the Son Himself proceedeth from the Father by eternal Generation, and that the Father alone is "*the Principle and Source of the whole*

Godhead;" as we have already quoted from the words of the glorious Father S. Augustine. The Holy Ghost does indeed proceed from the Father, and the Father alone, as from the one single Origin of the whole Godhead; but that He proceeds also eternally, though secondarily, from the Son, necessarily follows from this great truth that our Lord affirms, that the Son hath all things, whatsoever the Father hath, His distinctive Personality excepted: which is what the great Pope Eugenius IV. so beautifully expressed, when in his Letter of Re-union he said, "Quoniàm omnia, quæ Patris sunt, Ipse Pater Unigenito Filio Suo gignendo dedit, *præter esse Patrem;* hoc ipsum quod Spiritus Sanctus procedit ex Filio, Ipse Filius æternitalitèr habet, à quo etiam æternitalitèr genitus est."*

And centuries before Pope Eugenius, and before the division of East and West, the great S. Augustine had said the very same thing:—

"Ideo Ille Filius est Patris, de quo est genitus, Iste autem *Spiritus Utriusque,* quoniam *de Utroque procedit.* Sed ideò cùm de Illo Filius loqueretur, ait: De Patre procedit, quoniàm Pater processionis ejus est Auctor, qui talem Filium genuit: et gignendo, Ei dedit ut etiam de Ipso procederet Spiritus Sanctus."†

Is it possible for words to speak plainer? I do not say that what they affirm is intelligible to human intellect, but is it not clear even as the light of day, that what Pope Eugenius affirmed in the 15th century, at the Council of Florence, after so many ages of bitter controversy, S. Augustine, that glorious light of the Church, whose orthodoxy the East has ever vied with the West in proclaiming, no less distinctly affirmed?

Either then the Eastern Church has erred along with that of the Latins in proclaiming the orthodoxy of S. Augustine, or it is true what he affirms, that the Son in receiving all things from the Father, His Paternity alone excepted, received from Him eternally, that the Holy Ghost should proceed

* "Seeing that the Father Himself in the begetting of His Eternal Son gave all things unto Him, except to be the Father; so that very thing, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son, the Son Himself eternally hath from Him, by whom and of whom He is eternally begotten."—*Pope Eugenius IV.*

† "He therefore is the Son of the Father, in that He is begotten from Him; but the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of them both, because from both He proceedeth. And, therefore, when the Son spoke of the Holy Ghost, He said that He "proceedeth from the Father," because the Father is the Author of that Procession, who begat such a Son, and in begetting Him, gave unto Him that the Holy Ghost should proceed from Him also."—*S. Augustini.* lib. ii. *alias* iii. *Cont. Maxim.* c. 14.

from Himself also. And I remember some years ago, when I was discoursing on this very subject with a Greek bishop, he acknowledged to me, what was equivalent to these words of S. Augustine. He said, "I have always thought that there was one strong argument for the Latin statement: we have all acknowledged on both sides, both Greeks and Latins, that the Son was the Wisdom of the Father, that is, His Knowledge or Understanding of Himself and of His own Infinite essence and perfections, and so also the Holy Ghost is His Love of the same, but there must be an eternal Union of Love between the Father and the Son, which would be the Eternal Procession of the Holy Spirit from each: so that as we call the Son the Wisdom or the Understanding of the Father, we may likewise term the Holy Spirit the Will of the Father and the Son, as He is also His own Will, His Personality proceeding from both: and yet of this double Procession the Father alone is the Origin, He being the Origin of the whole Godhead." Now it seemed to me, when I heard this Greek bishop expressing himself so clearly on this great Mystery, that when we come to lay aside the asperities of controversy there is no such real difference between the two Churches on this great question, nothing but what might be satisfactorily explained so as to lead to mutual agreement in the holding of the One Catholic and Apostolic Faith. We have seen how explicit is the teaching of the great S. Augustine, and how entirely it concurs with that which the Latin Church upholds at the present day, and yet although that was known to the Holy Fathers and Doctors of the Greek Church in ancient times, long before the unhappy severance, it never led to any misunderstanding or dispute between them in those times. Then why should it do so now? Why has it done so for so many ages since the manifestation of the great division, that has so miserably rent Christendom in twain? Surely this ought not so to be. But it will be said, that the Latin statement is irreconcileable with the general *consensus* of the rest of the Fathers, and that on this point the opinion of S. Augustine, even if admissible, is but the opinion of a single theologian of the Primitive Church, however great and venerable he may be. To this we reply, that the teaching of the other Fathers in no way contradicts that of S. Augustine: for however much they may abstain from contemplating the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, although they dwell on His Procession from the Father alone, that arises simply from the fact that they regarded the Father as the sole Origin and Principle of the whole Godhead, which is

most true, and to deny it would be the most tremendous blasphemy, but it is perfectly consistent with this, to take our Lord's own words, as S. Augustine does, and to see that they are incapable of any reasonable interpretation, unless by the admission, that the Father, in conferring "*all things* that He had" upon His only-begotten Son, gave unto Him also that the Holy Spirit should eternally proceed from Him: but then if it was the Father who gave this, the Father is the sole Author of the Holy Ghost, as He is also of the Son Himself.

S. Alphonso Liguori and other Latin theologians quote also numerous passages from even the Greek Fathers, and the early Œcumenical Councils, which entirely confirm the statement of S. Augustine concerning the eternal Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as well as from the Father.

Thus the Council of Ephesus, the Council of Chalcedon, and the Second and Third Councils of Constantinople, all and each of them, approved the Synodal Letter of S. Cyril of Alexandria. In that letter we find these remarkable words: "The Holy Ghost is called the Spirit of Truth; now the Truth is Christ; hence He proceedeth from Him, like as from the Father." Surely words cannot be plainer. It is clear, therefore, that these Councils in confining the statement in the Creed to the Procession from the Father alone, must have understood that definition in the sense of S. Cyril, or they would have contradicted themselves in their approval of his Synodal Letter: and it is therefore in vain that the declaration of these same Councils is cited, proclaiming the all-sufficiency of the statement (Qui ex Patre procedit), and forbidding under anathema any additional statement: for this addition they had already virtually approved in approving S. Cyril's Synodal Letter which contained it.

We now however come to the second question which we laid down at the commencement of this treatise: Was the addition of the two words, "*Filioque*," made by a competent authority? Was it made by the authority of the Œcumenical Church?

To this we have no hesitation in replying that it was.

It appears to us perfectly useless in deciding this point to enter at length, as many writers, both Greek and Latin, have so often done, into the whole tangled history of the controversy, to inquire what part the great Emperor Charlemagne had in determining it, or how far successive Popes hesitated in giving their concurrence to this verbal addition to the Creed. We have already shown that the doctrine as propounded by

S. Augustine and S. Cyril was approved by the earlier Councils, which defined the original statement of the Creed, before the addition of the Filioque. But the addition of those words was at a later period solemnly approved by the universal body of pastors, both Greek and Latin, in the Fourth Council of Lateran, held during the Pontificate of Pope Innocent III. in 1215. Both Latins and Greeks in that Council concurred in this solemn definition:

"*Pater a nullo, Filius a solo Patre, ac Spiritus Sanctus ab utroque pariter, absque initio semper, ac sine fine.*" That is: "The Father is from none other, the Son from the Father alone, and the Holy Ghost is from both alike, ever without beginning and without end."

In the second Council of Lyons, in 1247, during the Pontificate of Pope Gregory X., the Greeks again concurred with the Latins in defining the same Procession of the Holy Spirit:

"Fideli ac devotâ confessione fatemur, quod Spiritus Sanctus ex Patre et Filio, non tanquam ex duobus principiis, sed tanquam ab uno, non duabus spirationibus, sed unicâ spiratione procedit." That is: "We acknowledge in faithful and devout confession, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son, not as though from two Principles, but from one, not from two Spirations, but from one single Spiration."

Finally, in the Council of Florence, which was held in 1438 under the Pontificate of Pope Eugenius IV., both Greeks and Latins defined this declaration of Catholic Faith:

"Ut hæc fidei veritas ab omnibus Christianis credatur et suscipiatur, sicque omnes profiteantur, quod Spiritus Sanctus ex Patre et ex Filio æternaliter, tanquam ab uno Principio et una Spiratione, procedit." And this was also added: "Definimus insuper, explicationem verborum illorum *Filioque*, veritatis declarandæ gratiâ, et imminente tunc necessitate, licitè ac rationabilitèr, symbolo fuisse appositam."

That is: the Council of Florence defined "That this Truth of Faith be believed and accepted by all Christians, and that according to this tenor all should profess, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth eternally from the Father and from the Son, as from one Principle and by one Spiration."

After which the whole was summed up in these words:

"Moreover we define, that those words, *Filioque*, were added to the Creed as an explanation to declare the Truth, out of a necessity then pressing, lawfully and reasonably."

After this declaration, solemnly made in a Council, which was held for the very purpose of fairly representing both the

Eastern and Western Churches, and for the peaceful termination of theological differences, and for their Corporate Re-union in the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic and Orthodox Faith, we may confidently affirm, that the whole question between the East and West has been cleared up, and though from untoward circumstances, and chiefly from the conquest of the Greek Empire by the Mahometan Turks, this blessed Re-union has been suspended, still let us hope and pray, that, under the Pontificate of our most blessed Father, Pope Pius IX., in the great Œcumenical Council which at length is announced to the Christian world, once more the Unity of Christendom may be re-established on a solid basis, never again to be broken: that all divisions and controversies on matters of Faith may cease, and that all who profess and call themselves Christians may hold the Truth in unity of faith, and in godliness of life.

AMBROSE L. M. P. DE LISLE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Dr. Newman on Anglican Orders.

[The following very remarkable Letter from a distinguished clerical convert to the Roman Catholic Church has been sent to us, with the writer's permission, by the clergyman to whom it was originally addressed:]

My Dear . . . . .—You ask me how Dr. Newman's recent letter on Anglican Orders has impressed myself and those among Catholics, especially converts, whose sympathies accord with mine, and you observe at the same time that you have read with considerable surprise so feeble an argument from a writer of such transcendent power. I need hardly say that any utterance of Dr. Newman's must always command the respectful attention at least of all intelligent men, whether in your Communion or in ours. It may be pretty safely assumed that whatever view he has to put forward will be stated by him with the greatest force and perspicuity which the case admits of. And his letter on Anglican Orders forms no exception. It would be very difficult, I believe, to express at once so concisely and so pointedly the utmost that can be honestly urged against the English succession by a writer who has arrived at an adverse conclusion and who has any real acquaintance with the facts. That the argument is weak, I admit, and will presently explain why I think so. But that is not the writer's fault.

I. Into what he calls the "antiquarian," and what I should prefer to call the historical argument, Dr. Newman declines to enter, though he implies, if I rightly understand him, that the "*probable* conclusion" from it is favourable to the validity of Anglican Orders, and that supposing the historical evidence was "*sufficient*"—*i. e.* of course morally conclusive—there would be no room for introducing such "antecedent presumptions" as he has alone dealt with. On the other hand, supposing the historical evidence to break down, any reference to such collateral topics would obviously be superfluous. Now my own conviction has always been, as you are aware, that the probability in favour of English Orders, as gathered from the direct evidence, amounts to moral certainty, which is the highest kind of certainty attainable in such questions. I have therefore myself no more doubt of their validity than I have of the validity of the Orders of the Catholic Church or of the Greeks. And all I have read and heard on the subject, which I have had opportunities of dis-

cussing with many Catholic divines, both English and foreign—most of whom took the opposite side—has confirmed me in that conviction. But it is no part of my business here to enter upon the historical argument, on which however the whole question really hinges, nor would it be possible to do so to any purpose within the limits of a single letter. Meanwhile you will not have failed to observe that the fact of Dr. Newman's pointedly refusing to lay any stress on that argument as against your Orders, is in itself very significant; and it is worth remembering that the line of *à posteriori* objections, which he has felt compelled exclusively to rely upon, was never broached or thought of till the attempt to discredit the succession on historical grounds, and especially by the famous Nag's Head fable, had become desperate.

II. We have then now to consider the "three presumptions" which Dr. Newman urges on the adverse side. It will be best to take them in his own order, for the arrangement is not accidental. He begins with the weakest point, and winds up with the strongest. It is hardly necessary to say that all of them have long been as familiar to my mind as to yours, for they have been alleged over and over again during the last twenty years by successive assailants of Anglican Orders, and constitute in fact what may be called the stock popular arguments on the subject. But though there is nothing new in the matter, it acquires that freshness in the method of statement which belongs to everything which comes from Dr. Newman's pen. I am however simply stating the impression left by his letter, not only on my mind but on that of others whose judgment is far weightier than my own, when I say that in giving to this collateral line of argument the utmost force and clearness of expression it is capable of, he has only illustrated more clearly its inherent weakness.

(1.) The first point need not detain us long. Whether or no the Apostolical Succession be a "tradition of," or only "in, the Anglican Church," or neither, cannot surely affect the existence of the succession one way or the other. If not a single bishop on the bench believed in it (to put the extremest hypothesis) that would not disprove their possession of the gift, as neither would the belief of the whole Episcopate avail one iota to supply its absence. Take a parallel case: Baptismal Regeneration is certainly not a tradition either "of" or "in" the Wesleyan body. On the contrary, it would be repudiated by every minister and member of that sect. Yet Dr. Newman will not deny that, wherever the essentials of the Sacrament are complied with, the gift is really conferred through the ministry of Wesleyan preachers. The same principle will apply to the transmission of the priesthood in the Church of England. It is not therefore important to examine the accuracy of Dr.

Newman's estimate of the facts, though I am disposed to think with you that he has overstated the case when he speaks of the Apostolic succession as not being a tradition of the Anglican Church, and as being repudiated by most of its dignitaries in our own day. Whatever may be said of the validity of Parker's consecration, there can be no doubt that great importance was attached to it at the time, and that great pains were taken to secure a valid consecration. And from the beginning of the Caroline School downwards the Apostolic Succession has been, I should have supposed, the dominant tradition of the Anglican Church; from the first it was expressly laid down in the Prayer Book. If my memory does not deceive me, Dean Stanley mentions in his Life of his father, as an act of signal *courage* on his part, when Bishop of Norwich, that he preached on some public occasion *against* the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession. That such a proceeding on the part of a bishop should be regarded as a proof of exceptional boldness—and that some thirty years ago, when the High Church party was not near so strong as it is now—seems to indicate clearly enough what is and has been the received tradition on the subject.

(2.) The next point referred to by Dr. Newman is perhaps the commonest of all the popular arguments against English Orders. If there is a true Succession, there must be a true Eucharist, and how does this consist with the general disbelief in the Real Presence and the irreverent handling which results from it? The argument is of a kind which appeals strongly to the feelings, though it cannot be said to have any logical force. But whatever weight may be attached to it, I believe that it really tells the other way. No doubt there has been in the Anglican Church an almost universal rejection of Transubstantiation (based however in great measure on a traditional misapprehension of its meaning, as Mr. Cobb has conclusively shown in *The Kiss of Peace*), and a widely spread disbelief in the Real Presence altogether. But on the other hand there has been all along an influential tradition among both clergy and people of belief in the Real Presence, which is unmistakeably taught in the Catechism and the Ritual. And in the present day I suppose there are, to speak cautiously, many hundreds of your clergy, and many thousands of the laity, who believe exactly as we do on the subject. *Is there any single Communion without a priesthood in which this phenomenon can be paralleled?* Or, to put it in another form, does not the Church of England, if it be without a priesthood, present a phenomenon in this respect absolutely unique in ecclesiastical history? I speak under correction, but I should be much surprised to learn that there is any trace of a belief in consecration, and the Sacramental Presence as dependent on it, to be found among the ministers of any single Dissenting community in England, or among the Scotch Presbyterians, or any of the Protestant bodies on the

Continent. The very suggestion sounds almost like a satire. That there should be a great revival of that belief, expressing itself in various forms of ritual and devotional observance, among the clergy of a Church which had for three centuries been destitute of a true priesthood, is not indeed inconceivable, though it is quite unprecedented; and if the historical argument told against your Orders, I do not think you would have any right to rely on such *á posteriori* considerations as a substitute for it. But if we are to quit the historical ground and deal with subjective arguments, and "antecedent presumptions," and the "urgency of visible facts," then this fact must certainly be taken for what it is worth as a strong presumption in your favour.

But even waiving this point, it seems to me that the argument from Anglican disesteem of the Eucharist, however plausible, is a very dangerous one for us to employ. To say the least it proves too much. We are playing with edged tools. Are there no Catholic priests, both of our own and former days, of whom it would be impossible "without distressing or offending" a Catholic, "to describe what sort of custodes they have been, and are, to their Eucharist?" What for instance of too many Italian priests of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries? What of the Milanese clergy when S. Charles first took possession of that See? What of the Roman priests whose glaring profanity in celebrating Mass gave the first shock to the faith of Luther? Or to come to our own day, what of those South American priests whose scandalous lives are a by-word, and of whom the late Emperor Maximilian—a loyal and pious Catholic—speaks in his journal as "not priests, but men in black coats who read Mass"? Or what again of the rank and file of the Russian country clergy, who are commonly reported to be sunk in the lowest depths of ignorance and animality, but of whose valid priesthood nobody entertains a doubt? Might not the terrible reproof be addressed to any of these, "O bone custos, cui commendavi Filium Meum?" Are they fitter custodians of the Eucharistic gift than the mass of the Anglican clergy? Perhaps it will be said, that at least all of them believed in it. It is more than probable that some of those I have referred to did not. There was a wide-spread infidelity, to mention one example only, in the Roman and Florentine society of the fifteenth and first half of the sixteenth century, which had penetrated all ranks of the clergy even to the very highest. Pope Alexander VI. told Pico de Mirandola that he did not believe in God, and the probability is that Leo X. was also an infidel, though there is not the same direct evidence of it. But supposing all these unworthy custodians of the Eucharist did and do believe in it, so much the worse. It is certainly, to adopt Dr. Newman's language, most "charitable

towards the bulk" of them to assume their unconsciousness of the treasure committed to their keeping. I am loth to dwell on a painful subject, but as it is certain that our Lord *has* "left Himself for centuries in such hands," it seems to me that the less said about this line of argument against Anglican Orders the better. Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

(3.) Dr. Newman's last point is the most plausible, and at first sight it looks formidable, though I do not think it will bear inspection. I mean the threadbare argument drawn from the alleged insecurity of Anglican baptisms. In the first place, like the last argument, it proves too much. When Dr. Newman speaks of our Lord not having "left a *rigid rule* of baptism" in the English Church, I presume he means that the rule is not rigidly followed, for the letter of the Anglican rubric guards all the essentials of the Sacrament quite as securely as the letter of the Roman rubric. But who can venture to affirm that there has never been any carelessness or wilful perversity in the administration of baptism, whether by priest or layman, (for doctors and nurses often have to baptise) in the Catholic Church during eighteen centuries? Consider the gross ignorance prevalent among the clergy during part of the middle ages. It is on record, again, that S. Charles Borromeo found his priests at Milan ignorant even of the form of absolution. Consider on the other hand the vicious lives of many of the clergy in all ages, and the probably numerous instances, at one period, of Jews and Moors who concealed their misbelief rising to high places in the Spanish Church. Such miscreants, hating the religion they outwardly professed under terror of the Inquisition, would not only be careless in administering Sacraments, or have a defective intention—which is the worst that can be urged against the Evangelicals—but, if they knew enough theology to understand what they were about, would do all that in them lay, out of deliberate malice, to vitiate the effects of the ordinances they were constrained to celebrate. Perhaps it will be replied, that in such cases the principle of "the baptism of desire" comes into play, and thus the child who through no fault of his own had been invalidly christened would be *coram Deo* a baptised Christian, and therefore a subject of valid ordination. But if this explanation is allowed to cover exceptional cases among Catholics or Greeks, there is no reason for not extending it to Anglicans also. If it is not admitted, and the argument from careless baptisms is rigidly pressed against Anglican Orders, it will shake the validity of every sacrament (except baptism) administered throughout Christendom. There can be no *mathematical* certainty of the valid consecration of any single priest or bishop, Catholic or Greek any more than Anglican. Whether "in the Anglican Church" or elsewhere, "it is very difficult to deny that

every now and then a bishop was a consecrator who had never been baptised," and this is all that Dr. Newman ventures to assert. But the antecedent probabilities are immense against *all three* bishops who take part in a given consecration being unbaptised. Yet this must have happened, not once but over and over again, before the succession of the Church of England could be destroyed. An occasional break in the chain would very soon right itself. And although, where there is a distinct reason for doubting about the valid administration of a sacrament in some particular instance, the rule is to repeat it conditionally in the absence of any specific ground for doubt, the presumption is always in favour of its validity. If individuals were encouraged or allowed to question the sufficiency of their baptism, unless on some special ground affecting their own case, nobody could feel secure. I may add that our present custom of conditionally re-baptising converts is of comparatively recent introduction. In the last century, when a Scotch Presbyterian lady, who joined the Catholic Church at Rome, was anxious to be re-baptised, it was peremptorily forbidden by the authorities.

On the whole I think that you, or rather all lovers of truth, may be congratulated on the appearance of Dr. Newman's letter. It is always an advantage to be able to gauge the full strength of an objection, and therefore well to have it stated by its most competent advocate. This service Dr. Newman has rendered to the inquiry about Anglican Orders. Hitherto the adverse view has been usually maintained by writers too ignorant, or too prejudiced (not to say disingenuous) or both, to have any real weight, and their refutation was too easy to be quite satisfactory. Catholic writers of mark did not touch the question, or, like Bossuet, they have left on record an opinion favourable to the English succession. It has now at last been taken up by a theologian of consummate ability and of the highest character, who is well acquainted with its true bearings, and feels it his duty to say all that can honestly be said in defence of the current view. We see how very little that all comes to, and we know that there is nothing to be added to it.

I am writing against time, and in the midst of pressing engagements, and must beg you to excuse the hurried composition of this letter. The opinions it contains have not been hastily adopted, but are the result of study and reflection, and have been matured through many years.

I remain, yours sincerely,

* * *

Sept. 26, 1868.

P.S.—Since my letter of Sept. 26 was written, and was in your hands, a second letter of Dr. Newman's, in reply to the Rev. T. W. Mossman, has appeared in the *Month* for October,

explaining and supplementing his former argument. It has of course no direct bearing on what I had previously written, except in so far as Mr. Mossman has touched on some of the same points which had occurred to me also, but I shall probably best meet your wishes if I add here, by way of Postscript, such remarks as seem called for by the new matter it contains.

The two additional points which I understand Dr. Newman to bring forward are briefly these:—(1.) That the force of his argument is *cumulative*, and cannot be adequately gauged by the strength of each of his three presumptions taken singly; (2) that the fact of objections to the Anglican succession having been constantly maintained by Catholic writers during the last three centuries is in itself a *primâ facie* argument against it. There is some further matter, not strictly argumentative but illustrative, which shall be noticed by-and-by.

I. First, then, as to the cumulative force of the alleged presumptions, my reply is twofold—

(*a*) Dr. Newman explicitly admits that if there were any "historical or other (?) demonstration" of the validity of your Orders, no cumulation of presumptions could tell against it. He thinks however, though he declines to discuss the point, that there is no conclusive historical evidence. I think, as I said before, that there *is;* and that it is, to use his own words, "equivalent to a demonstration"—not of course a mathematical demonstration, for that the nature of the case precludes equally as regards Anglican Orders or our own, but a moral demonstration, which is alone possible and is therefore sufficient. And I hold this moral certainty to be as clear in your case as in ours. This then would be my first answer to the allegation of any amount of mere *à posteriori* presumptions, whether singly or cumulatively urged—that the direct historical evidence puts them out of court to begin with. And it is necessary to insist on this point, because there is a tendency in some quarters to assume that, because the historical evidence has been on various grounds and at various times called in question, there must be a flaw somewhere, whereas the fact that a number of objections have been successively raised, which have been successively (and successfully) demolished, points to an exactly opposite inference. It would be hard, I fear, to find any fact having a controversial interest, "which nobody can *deny*." The Pope's recent letter to the Protestants *e.g.* says that "nobody can deny" a whole string of propositions which about a third of the Christian world has been loudly denying for some centuries past. But a fact which during three centuries of bitter controversy nobody has been able to *disprove* stands really on much stronger ground than a fact which has never been disputed, merely because nobody happened to have an interest in disputing it.

(β) But, secondly, admitting for argument's sake Dr. Newman's hypothesis that the historical evidence is inconclusive, and that there is therefore room for weighing collateral presumptions, I don't quite understand him when he says that even though you could snap in two *each stick* in the bundle, if taken separately, there is still some force in the whole bundle taken collectively. No doubt a number of *weak* presumptions taken together are worth rather more than a single weak one, though a shred of direct evidence on the other side would outweigh them all. But fifty presumptions which are not only *weak* but *worthless* are of no more value than one. The strength of a chain is proverbially the strength of its weakest link, much more if *every* link in the chain, or *every* stick in the bundle, can be "snapped in two"—in other words, if every stick is *rotten*—then the whole bundle is rotten, and it matters nothing how few or how many sticks it contains. Fifty 0's will never make 1. Now this is just what Dr. Newman "allows for argument's sake," and what I have before tried to show is really the case, with his three presumptions, though it would be difficult to state them more forcibly than he has done. When they come to be analysed they either prove nothing, like the argument about Anglican tradition; or they are at least equally capable of being turned the other way, like the argument about profanation of the Eucharist; or they prove a great deal too much, like the favourite but suicidal argument about careless baptisms. As therefore I can attribute no argumentative force at all to any of the presumptions taken separately, I can attribute none to the three taken together.

II. Still less can I attach any weight to the fourth presumption, which Dr. Newman adds in his second letter, from "the very fact that elaborate arguments are necessary in proof of the validity of Anglican Orders." It seems to me decidedly the least happy he has selected, for more reasons than one. *Why* are these arguments necessary? The circumstance of a fact being questioned does not *per se* afford the faintest presumption even that it is questionable, unless it can be shown *that nobody had any interest* (other than pure love of truth) *in questioning it.* "Cæsar's wife should not be suspected." True, but I might quote Dr. Newman's own remark in the *Apologia*, that though plenty of mud may be thrown at an innocent person, it will not eventually stain, even if it should stick. He would not himself, I suppose, think there was a shadow of stain on the purity of Marie Antoinette notwithstanding the infamous scandal which has been industriously progagated about her, and which even in our own day historical writers think it necessary to meet with "elaborate" disproof. Her character was blackened simply because there were persons whose political or personal interest it was to blacken it. And the attack on

Anglican Orders had just the same kind of origin. Nobody has had any theological interest in questioning the Orders of the Catholic Church or the Greek, though Lord Macaulay does try to throw a slur on them (if I remember right, in his review of Mr. Gladstone's *Church Principles*, in the *Edinburgh*), in order to discredit the Sacramental principle altogether, which by the way appears to me the only logical upshot of Dr. Newman's line of argument. But, generally speaking, Protestants don't care two straws whether our Orders are valid or not; and High Church Anglicans, however bitter against Rome, would have no desire "to foul their own nest" by questioning the source from which the English succession is derived. On the other hand, it *was* held to be of supreme importance to discredit Anglicanism by showing if possible that it had no priesthood, and was therefore not merely a schismatical Church (as it is) but no Church at all. Mind, I think myself the policy was a wholly mistaken one, even regarded exclusively from the stand-point of immediate Catholic interests, and that an opposite line would have been infinitely more prudent as well as more candid and charitable. But that is nothing to the purpose. As a matter of fact the Jesuit missionaries of Elizabeth's reign, and those who have followed in their footsteps since, *did* think it necessary for Catholic interests to strain every nerve to disprove the Anglican Succession. Hence first the scandalous invention of the Nag's Head fable, which I believe there has been some attempt to revive in our own day. When that was too much blown upon for any respectable writer to be able to use it, the mare's nest about Barlow's consecration was thrust to the front, though even if his consecration could have been disproved it would have had no real bearing on Parker's, for of the Episcopal Orders of his three other consecrators there can be no doubt. When that broke down, the doctrine of intention was attempted to be worked in a way which, if it proved anything, would shake the validity of every sacrament in Christendom. Dr. Newman is of course too clear-sighted and too honest to rake up these exploded fallacies. But he does not seem to have observed how remarkably the whole history of the controversy about Anglican Orders, so far from tending to shake their validity, very strongly confirms it. At all events no one can profit by his own wrong. We have no right to argue that a matter is doubtful simply because we have done our best to involve it in doubt, though with very poor success. How stand the facts? A body of men, including some of the most accomplished divines and disputants of their day, and who for a century and a half after the Reformation shaped the intellect and guided the conscience of Catholic Europe, considered it, rightly or wrongly, to be of high importance for the interests of the Church to discredit the evidence for a particular alleged fact, which from the nature

of the case is incapable of demonstrative proof. The process of picking holes in it has been persistently pursued, as Dr. Newman is careful to remind us, through three centuries. And now at the end of the time every count in the indictment which has in turn been chiefly relied upon has broken down, and he is himself obliged to fall back on *a posteriori* presumptions which are at best of a purely suggestive character, and, as it seems to me (and I know to others also), are far more available weapons against sacramental doctrine altogether than against this or that particular episcopal succession. As to the Anglican Bishops not having been recognised as such by the Greeks, there has been hitherto no opportunity for any formal recognition, and the Eastern authorities have had neither the means nor the motive for examining the question. I am informed that the opinion of such of their learned men as have turned their attention to it is favourable, but you probably know more about this than I do.

And here I may just refer to an observation Dr. Newman repeats more than once, and which I do not understand, *viz.* that he would consider a decision of the Holy See or of an Œcumenical Council in favour of Anglican Orders equivalent to a demonstration on account of the "divine gift" entrusted to them. Now it appears to me that this is just one of those questions to be decided by human evidence, not by supernatural guidance. We are always told that the divine guidance of the Church, like Revelation itself, was vouchsafed to aid us in the knowledge of what lies beyond the reach of our natural faculties, but that we have no right to tempt God by seeking supernatural direction on matters perfectly within the compass of natural reason. "*Mundum tradidit disputationibus hominum.*" The practical decision of how Anglican Orders are to be treated must, from the necessity of the case, lie with ecclesiastical authority. But surely that authority would have to form its judgment not by divine guidance, but by sifting the historical evidence. To expect a revelation, or look for infallibility about it, seems as though *e.g.* one were to ask for a revelation as to whether or not S. Peter was ever at Rome, which is as much an historical question as the murder of Agricola.

There remain two passages in Dr. Newman's second letter which are rather rhetorical and illustrative than argumentative, on which it may be well in conclusion to say a few words.

(1.) When Dr. Newman asks for some precise parallel to the case of the Anglican Church, of a Communion which, after having, its Orders for three centuries ignored by East and West, has at the end of that period had them acknowledged, he must surely be aware that he is demanding an historical impossibility, and for this simple reason:—No single Communion which broke off from the Holy See at the Reformation, except the Anglican,

made, or could make, or cared to make, any claim to retaining its Succession. No other therefore could have its Orders "ignored," because by universal consent, including that of the parties themselves, there were no Orders to ignore. On the other hand (putting aside a few obscure mediæval sects) sacramental heresy was itself a new growth of the sixteenth century, and there was therefore no likelihood that any schismatical bodies of previous ages would either themselves be careless about their sacraments, or that it would occur to their opponents to taunt them with it. If however this demand is pressed, I will reply by another which I have made before, and which involves no such historical impossibility. Show me a single example of a religious body which for three centuries has possessed the form of a ministry only without the reality of priesthood (there are plenty of them in existence), and where at the end of that period the doctrines of priestly consecration, of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which had never been wholly lost sight of, are found more deeply rooted, more clearly apprehended, and more widely spreading than they were at the beginning. When that is done I may begin to think that "visible facts" do not harmonise with the historical evidence for your Succession.

(2.) I must honestly confess myself unable to grasp the exact point of Dr. Newman's "illustration parallel, though not similar," from some supposed Catholic country in the Western hemisphere three hundred years hence. In the first place, it seems to me obvious that, under the deplorable circumstances supposed, it *would* be the first duty of the Holy See to take all possible pains to ascertain whether the succession had been preserved before ignoring it, and substituting a new one in its place. But waving this point, the supposed case appears to me not only not "similar" to that of Anglicanism, but in no sense "parallel," nor has Dr. Newman explained in what he means the parallel to consist. Every single detail is so different, that there is absolutely nothing in the one picture to suggest the other to one's mind, and yet it is on a review of these hypothetical details that the Pope of the future is assumed to be justified in "ignoring without a word" the Orders of the delinquents. Supposing he were, it is difficult to see how it bears on his conduct towards Anglicans. That the hypothetical state of things described by Dr. Newman is only too like that described by the late Emperor Maxmilian, and other travellers, as actually existing "in parts of the Western hemisphere" is true enough; but as nobody questions the Orders of the Mexican or Brazilian priesthood now, their desecration of the Blessed Sacrament, so far as it has any bearing on the validity of your Orders, tells in your favour.

This postscript has run to a much greater length than I had

intended, and I feel more strongly than before how much better it might have been expressed. But I have no time for revision and polishing, and I think you will understand my meaning. As you wish to print the original letter, this addition had better be printed with it, but without my name. For nothing was further from my thoughts than to enter into a public controversy on the subject, least of all to come forward as the antagonist of Dr. Newman. I must however say, that his second letter has in no way diminished the impression left on my mind by the first, that such a method of attack on Anglican Orders, if it were admitted, would recoil with terrible force on Catholic Orders also, or, to speak more accurately, would tend to shake the whole system of sacramental belief. It is identical in principle with Macaulay's argument against the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. And I have good reason to know that this impression is shared by others among us whose judgment would carry far greater weight than mine. I might add that the same line of reasoning may be, and indeed has been freely, used against the evidences of Christianity altogether. Nothing can well be more unlike what the language of our Lord and His Prophets would lead us to expect than the "visible" aspect of modern Christendom. At the same time I also quite believe that Dr. Newman has adopted the only line of argument that an honest writer acquainted with the facts can use for the purpose. It is weak, because it is honest. The arguments on that side got their apparent force by distorting or suppressing or inventing facts. Of that of course he is as little capable as he would be of speaking in "wantonness" on such a subject.

Let me remind you in conclusion, that the sooner you and your friends can bring out an exhaustive work in vindication of your Orders, which is said to have been in contemplation for some years, the better. I am not without hopes that such a work might convince Dr. Newman himself that the historical argument is more conclusive than he thinks. Only it ought to be published certainly in French, and if possible in German also, as well as in English, or it won't reach most of those you want to influence. It would be well if it could appear before the coming Council.

Oct. 10, 1868.

FRAGMENTA VARIA.

LETTER APOSTOLIC FROM THE POPE TO THE ORIENTAL BISHOPS.

THE following is a careful translation of the Letters Apostolic:—

"Placed by the hidden design of Divine Providence, although without any desert of our own, in this exalted chair as heir of the blessed prince of the Apostles, who, by the prerogative granted to him by God, is the firm and solid rock on which the Saviour hath built the Church, and urged by the solicitude of the burden laid upon us, we long and strive most earnestly to extend our care to all, whatever region of the earth they inhabit, who bear the name of Christians, and to call them to the embrace of our fatherly love. We cannot, without grave danger to our soul, neglect any portion of the Christian people which, as having been redeemed by the precious blood of our Saviour, and added to the Lord's flock by the sacred waters of Baptism, rightfully claims all our watchfulness. Wherefore, as we are bound to bend unceasingly all our thoughts and desires to procure the salvation of all who know and adore Jesus Christ, we turn our eyes and our fatherly thoughts to those Churches which of yore, when united in the bonds of unity with this Apostolic See, flourished in such credit for sanctity and heavenly learning, and produced rich fruits of Divine glory and of the salvation of souls; but which now, by the nefarious arts and devices of him who first stirred up schism in heaven, exist to our great grief in a state of separation and division from the communion of the Holy Roman Church which is spread over the whole world.

"For this reason, at the very beginning of our Supreme Pontificate, we spoke to you words of peace and charity, with our whole heart's love. And, although our words did not have the desired result, still we have never lost the hope that our humble and fervent prayers would be graciously listened to by the most mild and benignant Author of peace and salvation, Who worked out salvation upon earth, and Who, as the Day-spring from on high, plainly showing forth the peace which He loves, and which He wishes to be loved by all, announced at His rising to men of good will, by the ministry of angels, and while sojourning among men taught it by His word, and preached it by His example.

"And now that, by the advice of our venerable brethren the

Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, we have convoked an Œcumenical Council to be held in Rome in the ensuing year, and to be commenced on the 8th day of December, the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of Mary the Virgin, Mother of God, we once more address ourselves to you, and, with all the power of our soul, we pray, we admonish, we conjure you to come to this General Council as your predecessors came to the Second Council of Lyons, held by the blessed Gregory, our predecessor of venerated memory, and to the Council of Florence, celebrated by our predecessor of happy memory, Eugene IV., that thus renewing the bonds of ancient affection, and recalling to life that ancient peace, the heavenly and blessed gift of Christ, which in the course of ages has become lost to us, we may make the serene brightness of longed-for union shine resplendent before all, after being long and sadly clouded, and after the painful darkness of long-lived dissension.

"May this be the joyful fruit of the benediction with which Jesus Christ, the Lord and Redeemer of us all, consoles His immaculate and beloved spouse the Catholic Church, and wipes away her tears in these times of affliction, that so, all divisions being healed, our voices, no longer discordant, may with perfect unanimity praise God, Who desires to see no schism between us, but commands us by the voice of His Apostle to say and think one and the same thing. May everlasting thanks be rendered to the Father of mercies by all His saints, and especially by the glorious ancient fathers and doctors of the Eastern Churches, when they see from heaven the restoration and re-establishment of the Apostolic See, the centre of truth and union, of that unity which they during their lives strove for with every endeavour and with untiring labour, both by their teachings and by their example. Let their thanks be paid for the diffusion in their hearts by the Holy Ghost of the love of Him Who, by His blood, earned peace and reconciliation for all, and Who enjoined that His disciples should be known by their unity, whose prayer to His Father was, 'I pray that all may be One, even as We are One.'

"Given at Rome, at S. Peter's, September 8, 1868, in the twenty-third year of our Pontificate."

THE POPE'S LETTER TO NON-CATHOLICS.

"PIUS, SOVEREIGN PONTIFF, NINTH OF THE NAME, TO ALL PROTESTANTS AND OTHER NON-CATHOLICS.

"You must already all know that we, who, despite our unworthiness, have been raised to the throne of Peter, and therefore have been advanced to the supreme government of the whole

Catholic Church, and to its administration, which has been entrusted to us in Divine fashion by Christ Himself, our Lord, we have judged it fitting to summon before us all our venerable brethren, the Bishops of all the world, and to convene them in an Œcumenical Council, which is to be celebrated next year, in such a manner, that with those same venerable brethren who have been summoned to take a part in this the subject of our solicitude, we may be able to adopt all the most opportune and necessary resolutions to dissipate the shadows of so large a number of pestilential errors which daily are extending their power and license, to the great prejudice of souls, and daily more and more to establish and strengthen among the Christian peoples committed to our watchful care the reign of the true faith, of justice, and of the true peace of God. Relying, then, with a firm confidence, upon the close and affectionate bond of union which unites those our same venerable brothers to our person and to the Apostolic See, and who have never ceased at any period of our Pontificate to give to us and to the Apostolic See the most striking evidence of faith, of love, and of respect; we truly hope that as it has been in times past with other General Councils, so it may be in the present, that this Œcumenical Council convoked by us may bring forth, with the help of the Divine grace, the richest and most fertile fruits, to the great glory of God, and the eternal welfare of man.

"Therefore in that hope, and instigated and encouraged by the charity of our Lord Jesus Christ, who laid down His life for the salvation of the world, we cannot forbear, on the occasion of the meeting of the next Council, addressing our Apostolic and paternal word to all those who, while recognising that same Jesus Christ as our Saviour, and rejoicing in the name of Christians, yet still do not profess the veritable faith of Christ, or follow the communion of the Catholic Church. And if we do so, it is before all to warn, exhort, and supplicate them with all our zeal and all our charity to consider and seriously examine if they in truth follow the path prescribed by our Lord Jesus Christ, and which leads to eternal happiness. In fact, no one can deny or doubt that Jesus Christ himself, in order that all future human generations should enjoy the fruit of His redemption, built up here below His Church in the person of Peter—that is to say, the Church, One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, and that He granted to him all the necessary power in order that the faith should be preserved intact and entire, and that the same faith should be transmitted to all peoples, to all races, and to all nations, in such a manner that all men should be able to be united in His mystical body in baptism, and always to preserve it themselves until the entire development of that new life of grace without which no one can ever merit or obtain

life eternal, so that the same Church which constitutes the mystical body shall remain until the end of time firm and indestructible in its own constitution, developed in vigour, and furnishing to its children all that is necessary for life eternal.

"Now whoever wishes well to consider and examine with attention the different religious societies divided among themselves and separated from the Catholic Church which, since the time of the Lord Jesus Christ and His Apostles, has always uninterruptedly exercised and still exercises by means of its legitimate pastors the powers entrusted to her by our Lord Himself;—whoever, we say, shall thus examine, will easily convince himself that not one of those religious societies nor all religious societies together constitutes or in any way can be considered as the one and only Catholic Church which our Lord Jesus Christ founded, constituted, and desired; should wish that they cannot in any way be regarded as a member or as a part of that same Church, because they are visibly separated from all Catholic unity. As in fact those societies are deprived of that living authority established by God, who pointed out to mankind before all things the matter of faith and the rule of morality, who directed and presided over them in all things affecting their eternal welfare; therefore those societies themselves constantly varied in their doctrine: and this mobility, this instability, is unceasing. Every one can easily comprehend that this state of things is altogether opposed to the Church established by Christ our Lord, a Church in which the truth must always rest unaltered without being the subject of any change, as a charge entrusted to that same Church in order that she may preserve it in all its integrity, a charge for the care of which the presence of the Holy Ghost and its aid has been granted for ever to this Church. No one can ignore the fact that these differences of doctrine and opinion give rise to the social schisms, and that therefrom spring those innumerable sects and communions which are daily increasing, to the detriment of Christian and civil society. Whoever, in fact, recognises religion as the foundation of human society, cannot refuse to admit and avow the influence exercised over civilized society by those divisions and disagreements of principles of that nature, and of religious societies struggling one with the other; and also with what power the denial of authority established by God to regulate the conviction of the human intelligence, and to direct the actions of men both in their social and private life, has excited, has developed, and has fomented those most unfortunate troubles, those events, and those disturbances, which agitate and affect almost all nations in a most deplorable manner. Therefore, in order that all those who are not instilled with the principles of the unity and truth of the Catholic Church should seize the

occasion offered to them by this Council, in which the Catholic Church to which their ancestors belonged shows a proof of its complete unity, of its vigour, and of its inextinguishable vitality; that they should obey the necessities of their hearts, that they should strive to bear themselves away from that state in which they cannot be assured of their salvation; that they should address without ceasing the most fervent prayers to God that He would dissipate the cloud of error, and that He would bring them back into the bosom of the Church our holy mother, where their ancestors received the salutary nourishment of life, and which alone preserves in its integrity the doctrine of Jesus Christ, handing it down and dispensing the mysteries of celestial grace—we, therefore, who ought most zealously to fulfil all the duties of a good pastor, in accordance with the charge of our apostolic ministry entrusted to us by Christ our Lord Himself, and who ought to embrace all men in the world in our parental charity, we address this letter to all Christians separated from us—a letter in which we exhort and supplicate them to hasten to return to the fold of Christ. It is because we heartily desire their salvation in Jesus Christ, and fear one day to have to render an account of their souls to that same Jesus Christ our Judge, if we do not point out to them and open to them as much as is in us the way which they must follow if they would gain their salvation; also in all our prayers and supplications, and while performing acts of grace, we never cease humbly to ask for them both by night and day the celestial light, and the abundance of grace from the Eternal Pastor of souls; and whereas, despite our unworthiness, we fulfil upon earth the functions of the Vicar of Christ, we await with open arms the return of those wandering sons to the Catholic Church, in order that we may be able to receive them with all affection into the dwelling of the celestial Father, and make them participators in His everlasting treasures. It is that much-wished-for return to the truth and communion of the Catholic Church, upon which depends not only the salvation of each one in particular, but of the whole Christian Society, and the world will never enjoy true peace until it forms one flock under one pastor.

"Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, Sept. 18, 1868, in the twenty-third year of our Pontificate."

ORIGINAL POETRY.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

WHITHER, O Christian, with devotion burning,
  Turn'st thou most readily thine eager feet?
Whither, good soldier of the Cross, returning
  Hop'st thou most nearly with thy Lord to meet?

Surely 'tis there, where on the soul beseeching
  Grace in unstinted fulness is outpoured,
Basement and cornice of the Church's teaching,
  'Stablished and ordered by her risen Lord,—

Where our Redeemer, now in glory dwelling,
  Cares still for mortal man, supplies his needs,
Where, in a mystery beyond our telling,
  One wondrous Body all His faithful feeds.

Aye, *there* believers, low in reverence kneeling,
  See the true banner of their faith unfurled,
Gather new might and rise up boldly, feeling
  Strong for the struggle with a Christless world.

Nor do thou, sinner, penitent and lowly,
  Shrink from the Presence of thy God in fear:
Thou art unworthy;—so are saints most holy;
  Thou hast offended;—there is pardon here,

Pardon for all men; fear not then nor falter.
  Ask;—thou shalt have Him; seek Him;—thou shalt find;
Come unto Him here present on His altar,
  Patiently waiting, pitiful and kind.

Yes, He is here; for He Himself hath spoken
  Solemnly, simply, words to be believed,—
"This is My Body"—not alone a token—
  Verily taken and indeed received.

What though the elements from vision veil Him?
  Faith may embrace what Reason cannot see.
Let not the Christian dream his hope can fail him;
  Thy real in-dwelling, Lord, is pledged by Thee.

Come then with glad and reverent behaviour,
  Only repent; He wipes away sin's taint;
Man, claim the loving promise of thy Saviour,
  Rest for the weary, freshness for the faint.

Weld thyself with Him in this mystic union,
  Cling to Him closely and His Name confess,
Pray that with Him thou may'st have full communion,
  Try Him and trust Him; He will surely bless.

R. B. A.

DE PROFUNDIS EXCLAMANTES.

A SEQUENCE FOR ALL SOULS' DAY.

Out of the deep, O Christ, we call to Thee,
Lord, hear our voice in heaven Thy dwelling-place:
For those departed in Thy faith and fear
Thy suppliant Church entreats: O Lord, give ear,
Let shine on them the brightness of Thy Face
And grant them rest. All sinners though we be,
And may not stand if Thou should'st be extreme
To notice aught amiss, yet let to-day
The salutary Sacrifice avail
For those whom Thou didst by Thy Blood redeem.
That which Thou offer'dst to the Father, may
We offer it, for them effectual,
That Thou mayst in Thy pity set them free.
For by the law of their condition, they
Now can abide before Thee; therefore turn
O Lord, their bondage. Now they hope in Thee,
Then draw them forth up to Thy palace gate.
In Thee they hope and trust; for Thee they yearn,
Morning and evening yearn they, day and night,
And in the deep Thy saving health await.

Then let them, Lord, Thy bounteous pity learn;
Be Thou to them full confidence and might,
And purge them as we pray from every stain.
Lo now Thy Mother, lo Thy Saints entreat,
Let not their fervent prayers be spent in vain,
But hear their intercessions, as is meet.
Kind Jesu, glorious King, Who on the Cross
Once lifted, showed for sinners such great love,
Hear now our congregation's earnest prayers
In Thy great mercy. Save them from all loss,
Break through the gates of death, foil Satan's snares,
And let the souls attain eternal joys above.

M.

LITERARY NOTICES.

Sketches of the Rites and Customs of the Greco-Russian Church, (Rivingtons), by an English lady married to a Russian officer, and who has long been a resident in her adopted country, did not need the introduction of the authoress of the "Heir of Redcliffe" to commend it to the favourable notice of English readers. But Miss Yonge has done well nevertheless to call attention to the peculiar interest of such a work at this time, when the contemptuous ignorance or ignoring of Eastern Christianity so long prevalent among us is passing away, and our revived prayers for unity "seem at last to be so far answered that there is a certain heaving and moving in the dissevered fragments, and a few absolute efforts which, under God's grace, may lead to something more definite and authoritative." On what authority she volunteers the perplexing statement that "after *six* centuries of oneness, Rome finally severed herself and those Churches which had learnt to look to her as their guide" from the East, is not so obvious. Whether we date the great Schism from the disputes about Photius in the ninth century, or from the formal anathemas exchanged between Leo IX. and Michael Cerularius in the eleventh, her chronology is equally and widely incorrect. Madame Romanoff writes with hearty sympathy of the rites and customs of the Church in which, we presume, she has herself become a communicant, and naturally presents to us the bright side of the picture. Her account, for instance, of the condition and habits of the parochial clergy is very different from what would be gathered from common reports on the subject, and one is inclined to think she must have met with favourable specimens of the class. At the same time it is well to be able to check the sweeping charges so often brought against them by the testimony of an eye-witness, nor is there any appearance of a desire to suppress or colour facts. On one point in particular—the education of the Russian clergy from boyhood—we should much like to have some further information. The little that may be gathered from the biography (if it is to be regarded as a biography) of "Romàn the Reader" does not give one a very favourable impression, though it certainly shews that some at least of the candidates for the priesthood are youths of cultivation and of high refinement of thought and feeling. By-the-by

we hope Madame Romanoff will explain in a future edition the meaning of "malingering," which is apparently the Russian term for some schoolboy peccadillo, but which she has forgotten is not English.

The story of Roman includes a description of Baptism and the Unction—or in Western language, Confirmation—which is administered at the same time with it. The remaining five Sacraments and several other ceremonies of the Church are described in later chapters of the book. As regards Baptism it is startling to learn that the trine immersion which is enjoined (except in cases of extreme sickness, when sprinkling or affusion is allowed) requires so much skill on the part of the officiating priest, that babies are sometimes "drowned at the very moment they are made Christians." It would surely not be difficult to provide against so deplorable a contingency. But the characteristic feature which strikes an external observer about all the peculiar arrangements of the Eastern Church is a want of flexibility. Every minutest detail has been left unchanged for centuries. Thus, for instance, the "Great Fast" (of Lent) is observed with a strictness which the feebler constitutions or less energetic dovotion of the West would find practically impossible, and with none of the relaxations which the annual Indulgences of the Holy See have made the general rule of the Roman Obedience. One custom of the Russian Church is certainly not primitive. Annual confession and Communion is the usual practice of the laity, and is, indeed, in many cases, almost enforced by law; none of the laity, if we understand our authoress aright, go oftener than twice a year. Children before the age of seven, when they make their first confession, are communicated twice a year, with the chalice only. Madame Romanoff can hardly be mistaken in the form of absolution quoted, as she tells us the book has been revised by some of the Russian clergy, but we are surprised to find it couched in the same absolute terms as our own: "I, unworthy Priest that I am, by the power given to me, do forgive and absolve thee from all thy sins," &c. The "absolvo te" was first introduced into the Roman ritual, whence the Anglican has borrowed it, in the thirteenth century, mainly through the influence of S. Thomas, who wrote a short treatise on the subject; and we had always imagined that the indirect form survived in the East in the administration of this Sacrament, as of Baptism. There seems to be absolutely no ground for the distinction sometimes drawn between the method of administering Extreme Unction (so it is here designated) in the Greek and Roman Churches. Madame Romanoff tells us that it is only allowed to those dangerously sick. The same rule holds good, as in the West, against administering it to those who are in danger of death from any other cause, as *e.g.* soldiers going into battle.

In cases of consumption it is sometimes solemnised in church. The account of Ordination in the Russian Church here given is, unfortunately, very meagre. On the other hand, the marriage and funeral ceremonies are most elaborately described; it is curious to find that an ordained Reader is married *in his alb!* Priests, Deacons, and Readers are of course buried in their canonicals. In the case of mixed marriages *both* parties must have *confessed* and communicated during the previous year, and a stipulation is required that the children shall be brought up in the Greek faith. Such at least is the letter of the law, but we suppose that, like several other regulations mentioned in this volume, it is frequently ignored. If the former condition were invariably complied with, marriages between orthodox Russians and Protestants would be impossible, and we may presume that the latter will not be carried out in the intended marriage between the King of Bavaria and the daughter of the Czar. One of the most interesting chapters in the volume is that on "Adoption," a beautiful and touching observance quite peculiar to the Russian Church, and we regret that we cannot find room for any extracts from it, or indeed for any extracts at all. But all who are interested in the condition of the Eastern Church will do well to consult Madame Romanoff's vivid "sketches" of it for themselves. The general impression left on one's mind is of a substantial identity both in faith and worship between East and West, extending even to many minor details of ceremonial. The profession of faith for a convert, quoted from the form used in the reception of the Princess Dagmar, differs very little, except of course in one point, from the Creed of Pius IV. Madame Romanoff is an enthusiastic admirer of the present Czar, who appears from her account to be idolized by his people. We should be very glad to hear more from her bearing on the subject of her present useful and attractive volume.

When the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. was substituted for the ancient Service Books of the Church of England, the old usages, traditions, and practices were practically known by everybody. There was no need, therefore, for more explicit directions than were contained in the new Service Book. Now, however, the case is wholly altered. Our Church has passed through the miseries of the Commonwealth, when vulgar fanaticism and unholy rebellion wiped out almost everything that was good, and true, and Catholic. After this came Dutch William and the unprincipled Revolution of 1688, with the Scotch Burnet's revolting Erastianism, so that ninety-nine persons out of every hundred have forgotten much which ought to be known to all. Hence Mr. Charles Walker, an earnest student of pure Church-of-England ritual, has provided us with a very practical and valuable manual just issued by

Mr. Hayes. It is entitled *The Services of the Church, with Rubrical Directions according to the Use of the Illustrious Church of Sarum, together with the Hymns, Introits, Graduals, Tracts, and Sequences of the same.* When we have said that the book is most adequately and properly represented in this title, that it is moreover compiled with great learning, much care, and good judgment, we trust we have said enough to induce all our readers to procure it for themselves, as a practical manual of the highest possible value published at a most reasonable cost. The notes and illustrative expositions are done with very great ability, and being thoroughly free from Protestant misbelief, most faithfully represent the true mind of our pure, primitive, and Apostolic Church.

The third series of Mr. E. T. Codd's *Sermons to a Country Congregation* (Masters) is quite equal to the former. The Sermons, plain, forcible, and attractive in their style, are admirable specimens for imitation. By no means deficient in exact theological statements, they are at the same time simple and eminently practical, while their hortatory portions are neither overstrained nor unreal. The University sermon is the least successful: that on "Time and Eternity" the most. But all are much above the average, and deserve to be generally known.

The Fourth Edition of Bishop Wordsworth's valuable *Catechesis* (Rivingtons) is before us. It needs no recommendation at our hands, for it is properly looked upon by many as a standard work. It is, moreover, unquestionably and thoroughly systematic, and conveys much information regarding the Christian religion.

We note with satisfaction that Dr. Lee's *Letter to Mr. Gathorne Hardy* (Bosworth) has reached a third edition, which is a proof, at all events, of the interest taken in Ecclesiastical politics.

The Rule of Faith, being the third volume of Mr. Hodges "Sixpenny Library," consists of an easy exposition of the Apostles' Creed. It is one of the best books we have come across for many a day, being accurate in its theology and admirably systematic in its plan.

Twenty Years at St. Matthew's, City Road (Masters), is a pleasantly-written and most interesting monograph. Church, schools, services, works of charity and mercy, are all described with lucidity and judgment in this valuable paper, read before the Parish Church Association. To all connected with the church and parish it will be peculiarly interesting: to others

most acceptable for the simple and scholarly record it contains of a solid, good, and efficient work.

We have received several numbers of *Sunday Stories for the Christian Year*, and *Church Ballads*, (Froome-Selwood: J. Hodges,) which on the whole are most admirable. They convey sound teaching in a lively and attractive form, placing before the reader the distinctive lesson of each Sunday in a plain and Catholic manner. *Not to be Daunted*, the October number of *Our Curate's Budget*, is a capital story for boys, showing how a clever boy, with industry, the fear of God, and a fair share of ambition, turned his talents to good account, and "got on" in the world.

Home for Christmas, (Masters,) is a gracefully written religious story for children, well adapted for a school prize.

Messrs. Hamilton, Adams and Co., have sent us *Two Lectures on Monasticism*, which are more unusually shallow and one-sided than the general run of such productions. Much of the writing, too, is quite as slipshod as the thought, which is always superficial and not unfrequently silly. The old stock Protestant arguments, not even newly furbished-up, look like theatrical "properties" in the sunshine.

Dr. Edward Burton's *Thoughts on the Separation of Church and State*, (James Parker and Co.,) should be purchased by every well-wisher to the Church of England. The able and thoughtful comments of an Oxford Reguis Professor of Divinity in 1834 are quite as much needed in 1868. Then our foes, with the exception of the Whigs, were outside the National Communion: now they are within it, and are doing the work of destruction with deadly craft and lamentable success.

The Scriptural Penitent, (Church Press Company,) six Lenten Lectures, deserves commendation. The writing is picturesque and yet forcible, and the teaching at once practical and sound.

Ceremonial detail, *Hints to Church-goers*, and *the Dress of the Clergy*, three small and cheap leaflets issued from the same place, are admirable in their statements and a valuable contribution to our presents needs. The second, in which "Anglican acrobats" are indirectly snubbed, is clear, practical, and likely to do us a good service.

People who are fond of pious and religious romances, especially those which are hung upon certain slender threads of truth, will find *The Life of Marie Eustelle Harpain*, (Burns,) acceptably good. It is full of the supernatural, heightened by the workings of imaginative minds, and with some persons its perusal may prove advantageous. We question, however, if

too much of such over-varnished religious biography is healthy. But on this point we do not care to dogmatize.

A notice of the second volume of Dr. Neale's *Commentary on the Psalms*, (Masters,) continued by Dr. Littledale, is deferred until our next volume commences.

Mr. Vaux has done good service to the Church cause by the publication of *Short Services for Congregational use, compiled in accordance with the Act of Uniformity*, (Palmer.) If, however, these and such as these are legal, and Sir Robert Phillimore is said to have so declared, why are we so constantly taunted with being State-bound? We notoriously have far more liberty than the Scotch Protestant Episcopalians.

Mr. MacColl's political pamphlet on the Irish Church, *Is there not a Cause?*—very clever, brilliantly written in some parts; eminently adroit in turning constitutional arguments against those who use them; trenchant and forcible in commenting on past scandals and Protestant persecution—is entirely spoilt, as a composition, first by its narrow and painful one-sidedness, and secondly by its gross and unjust attack on our present able and successful Prime Minister.

The publication at so reasonable a cost of Dr. Newman's most valuable *Parochial Sermons*, (Rivingtons,) goes steadily on to the great advantage of English clergymen. So, too, does that of Mr. Keble. His *Sermons Occasional and Parochial*, (Parkers,) are now nearly completed. Our readers, we feel confident, will be glad to know and note this.

Mr. J. R. West's *Short Treatise on the Holy Eucharist*, (Masters,) is a timely comment on the unsatisfactory theory of Dr. Waterland—at once clear, concise, and crushing. The arguments are most cleverly put, and the whole book is an important contribution to the Literature of this most Holy and adorable Sacrament.

Archdeacon Churton has published, as a supplement to Dr. Waterland's works, *Fourteen Letters to Zachary Pearce*, (James Parker and Co.,) which are of considerable literary and ecclesiastical interest. The Historical and Critical Preface prefixed is not the least valuable part of the publication, which will be acceptable to all who respect the orthodox divines of the last century, and their labours in defence of a sound Christian principle. The Archdeacon goes far to prove that the present Bishop of Lincoln would have wisely modified the language of his Preface to the new edition of Waterland on the Eucharist, a book vastly inferior to that by the late Archdeacon Wilberforce on the same subject.

Mr. William Michell's pamphlet *On the Education of the Clergy*, (Simpkin,) broad and liberal in its view, provides a mass of most valuable information regarding both the principles and details of clerical education abroad, and indirectly suggests several remedies for our present obvious defects at home. Such a production should be carefully studied by our bishops and authorities, for it is they who should take the lead in a judicious and wise reform. Cuddesdon, Wells, and Lichfield, have done *something:* but far more needs to be attempted, so as to develope the sacerdotal spirit, and assist in promoting the efficiency of our clergy.

J. Swift & Co., Regent Press, 55, King Street, Regent Street, W.

JUL 14 1938